

(4) In section 1611(b), proposing an amendment to subsection (9) of section 212(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, strike out "(E), (F), or (G)" and insert "(E)"; and

(5) strike out subsection (c) of the amendment, and renumber subsection (d) accordingly.

—Page 187, strike out line 19 and all that follows through page 189, line 20, and on page 192, lines 18 and 19, strike out "1601, and 1611" and insert "and 1601".

By Mr. RUDD:

—Page 148, line 1, insert "(1)" after "(c)".

Page 148, after line 5, insert the following:

(2) No funds may be appropriated to or for the use of the Panama Canal Commission for any fiscal year in excess of the amount of revenues deposited in the Panama Canal Commission Fund during such fiscal year, as such amount is estimated by the Secretary of Defense and certified by the Comptroller General at the time the budget request for the Commission for such fiscal year is submitted to the Congress. Not later than thirty days after the end of such fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to the Congress the actual amount of revenues deposited in the Panama Canal Commission Fund during such fiscal year. Any amount of funds appropriated to or for the use of the Panama Canal Commission for such fiscal year in excess of the actual amount of revenues so deposited in the Fund shall be de-

ducted from the amount that would otherwise be appropriated by the Congress under this subsection for the first fiscal year beginning after the report of the Secretary of the Treasury is received pursuant to this paragraph.

H.R. 3917

By Mr. LIVINGSTON:

—Page 21, add after line 3 the following:

SEC. 108. (a) Section 1512(b)(1)(A) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) a public agency which is established in that portion of the State in which the largest part of the population of the health service area resides and which agency only engages in health planning and development functions;"

—Page 26, line 18, strike out "Each" and insert in lieu thereof "Except as otherwise provided in this subparagraph, each".

Page 27, insert before the close quotation marks in line 4 the following: "In the case of a health systems agency which is a public agency described in subsection (b)(1)(A), 25 percent of the members of the governing body shall be selected by the Governor of the State in which the agency is established, 30 percent of the members shall be selected by the chief governing authority of each political subdivision within the health service area for which the agency is designated. The remaining members shall be selected under a process which assures that such remaining

members will not be nominated or selected by the governing body."

—Page 27, strike out line 24 and all that follows through line 7 on page 28 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) The second sentence of section 1512(b)(3)(A) is amended to read as follows: "Any other health systems agency shall have a governing body composed, in accordance with subparagraph (C), of not less than ten members and not more than thirty members."

H.R. 4440

By Mr. DINGELL:

—Page 33, after line 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. 317. (a) None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to implement or enforce any standard or regulation which requires any motor vehicle to be equipped with an occupant restraint system (other than a belt system).

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the use of funds provided in this Act for any research and development activity relating to occupant restraint systems.

(c) For purposes of this section, the terms "belt system" and "occupant restraint system" have the meanings given them in section 125(f) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 1410b(f)).

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### WAKING UP TO THE HORRORS OF COMMUNISM

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I call my colleagues attention to the ad on page A17 of the Washington Post for May 30, 1979. Joan Baez led a whole list of people, most of them entertainers and others of the "chic" crowd in an open letter to the Communist regime in Vietnam condemning their human rights violations.

Most of the signers were active in the anti-Vietnam war movement. I remember in June of 1972 when Miss Baez led a group of 2,000 women who marched around the Capitol to protest American involvement in Vietnam. She even withheld part of her income tax during the 1960's, because the money was used for military purposes. In 1967, she filed suit seeking the refund money seized from her bank account by IRS. Staughton Lind, another signer of the Post letter, had also withheld part of his taxes.

During the heyday of the anti-Vietnam demonstrations we were continually assured that the North Vietnamese Communists would not persecute the South Vietnamese after conquest. Now Miss Baez and company admit that "thousands of innocent Vietnamese, many whose only crimes are those of conscience, are being arrested, detained, and tortured in prisons and reeducation camps." According to the open letter,

"People are used as human mine detectors, clearing live mine fields with their hands and feet."

That is the reality of communism. Oppression, slave labor, executions for political "crimes." All Communist regimes are alike in this regard. The "moderate" Communist government of Tito's Yugoslavia is different only in degree from the "extremist" Communist government of Pol Pot's Cambodia. In this context "moderate" and "extremist" and differences in the quantity not the quality of the repression.

While millions of Cambodians were murdered by Pol Pot, the Tito dictatorship jails dissidents and uses its secret police to murder political opponents outside of Yugoslavia. The slave labor camps of the Soviet Union, Red China, and Cuba make those regimes less oppressive than Pol Pot and more repressive than Tito—at this time. The apparatus of mass murder remains in place in every Communist state.

It is late for Miss Baez and her friends to wake up. Too late for the Vietnamese victims. But, perhaps it is not too late for other potential victims. The next time the radical chic opinion molders assure us of Communist benevolence we should remind them of the late awakening of Joan Baez and her fellow travelers.

The text of the open letter and list of the signers follow:

#### WAKING UP TO THE HORRORS OF COMMUNISM

Four years ago, the United States ended its 20-year presence in Vietnam. An anniversary that should be cause for celebration is, instead, a time for grieving.

With tragic irony, the cruelty, violence, and oppression practiced by foreign powers in

your country for more than a century continue today under the present regime.

Thousands of innocent Vietnamese, many whose only "crimes" are those of conscience, are being arrested, detained and tortured in prisons and re-education camps. Instead of bringing hope and reconciliation to war-torn Vietnam, your government has created a painful nightmare that overshadows significant progress achieved in many areas of Vietnamese society.

Your government stated in February 1977 that some 50,000 people were then incarcerated. Journalists, independent observers and refugees estimate the current number of political prisoners between 150,000 and 200,000.

Whatever the exact figure, the facts form a grim mosaic. Verified reports have appeared in the press around the globe, from *Le Monde* and *The Observer* to the *Washington Post* and *Newsweek*. We have heard the horror stories from the people of Vietnam—from workers and peasants, Catholic nuns and Buddhist priests, from the boat people, the artists and professionals and those who fought alongside the NLF.

The jails are overflowing with thousands upon thousands of "detainees."

People disappear and never return.

People are shipped to re-education centers, fed a starvation diet of stale rice, forced to squat bound wrist to ankle, suffocated in "connex" boxes.

People are used as human mine detectors, clearing live mine fields with their hands and feet.

For many, life is hell and death is prayed for.

Many victims are men, women and children who supported and fought for the causes of reunification and self-determination; those who as pacifists, members of religious groups, or on moral and philosophic grounds opposed the authoritarian policies of Thieu and Ky; artists and intellectuals whose commitment to creative expression is anathema to the totalitarian policies of your government.

Requests by Amnesty International and others for impartial investigations of prison conditions remain unanswered. Families who inquire about husbands, wives, daughters or sons are ignored.

It was an abiding commitment to fundamental principles of human dignity, freedom and self-determination that motivated so many Americans to oppose the government of South Vietnam and our country's participation in the war. It is that same commitment that compels us to speak out against your brutal disregard of human rights. As in the 60s, we raise our voices now so that your people may live.

We appeal to you to end the imprisonment and torture—to allow an international team of neutral observers to inspect your prisons and re-education centers.

We urge you to follow the tenets of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant for Civil and Political Rights which, as a member of the United Nations, your country is pledged to uphold.

We urge you to reaffirm your stated commitment to the basic principles of freedom and human dignity . . . to establish real peace in Vietnam.

#### COSIGNERS

Ansel Adams, Photographer.  
Edward Asner, Actor.  
Albert V. Baez, Ph. D.  
Joan C. Baez.  
Peter S. Beagle, Writer.  
Hugo Adam Bedau, Professor of Philosophy, Tufts University.  
Barton J. Bernstein, Professor of History, Stanford University.  
Daniel Berrigan.  
Robert Bly, Poet.  
Ken Botto, Artist/Photographer.  
Kay Boyle, Professor, San Francisco State University.  
John Brodie, Broadcaster.  
Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, Former Governor of California.  
Yvonne Braithwaite Burke, Former U.S. Congresswoman.  
Henry B. Burnett, Jr., Editorial Chairman, Politics Today.  
Herb Caen, Journalist.  
David Carliner, General Counsel, American Civil Liberties Union.  
Cesar Chavez, Union Leader.  
Richard Pierre Claude, Editor, Universal Human Rights.  
Bert Coffey, Immediate Past Chairman, California Democratic Party.  
Norman Cousins.  
E. L. Doctorow, Writer.  
Benjamin Dreyfus, Attorney.  
Ecumenical Peace Institute Staff.  
Mimi Farina, Entertainer, Executive Director, Bread and Roses.  
Lawrence Ferlinghetti, Poet.  
Douglas A. Fraser, International President, United Auto Workers Union.  
Dr. Lawrence Zelig Freedman, Foundations Fund Research Professor in Psychiatry, University of Chicago.  
Joe Fury, Producer.  
Allen Ginsberg, Poet.  
Herbert Gold, Writer.  
David B. Goodstein, Publisher.  
Sanford Gottlieb.  
Richard J. Gouggenhime.  
Denis Goulet, Sr., Fellow Overseas Development Council.  
Bill Graham, Producer.  
Lee Grant, Actress.  
Peter Grosslight.  
Thomas J. Gumbleton, Bishop, Archdiocese of Detroit.  
Terence Hallinan, Attorney.  
Francis Heisler, Attorney.  
Nat Hentoff, Writer.  
Rev. T. M. Hesburgh, C. J. C., President, Notre Dame University.

John T. Hitchcock, Professor of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin.

Art Hoppe, Journalist.

Dr. Irving L. Horowitz, President, Transaction/Society.

Henry S. Kaplan, M.D., Stanford Medical Center.

R. Scott Kennedy, Resource Center for Nonviolence.

Roy C. Kepler, Member, War Resisters League.

Seymour S. Kety, Professor of Psychiatry, Harvard University.

Peter Klotz-Chamberlin, Resource Center for Nonviolence.

Jeri Laber, Executive Director, Fund for Free Expression.

Norman Lear, Producer.

Philip R. Lee, M.D., Professor of Social Medicine, University of Calif. at San Francisco.

Alice Lynd.

Staughton Lynd.

Bradford Lytle.

Frank Mankiewicz.

Bob T. Martin, News Editor, The Country Almanac.

James A. Michener, Writer.

Marc Miller, Director, Fund for Free Expression.

Edward A. Morris, Attorney.

Mike Nichols, Producer.

Peter Orlovsky, Poet.

Michael R. Peevey, President, California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance.

Geoffrey Cobb Ryan, Director, Fund for Free Expression.

Ginetta Sagan, Director, Humanitas/I.H.R.C.

Leonard Sagan, M.D., F.A.C.P.

Charles M. Schulz, Cartoonist.

Ernest L. Scott, Publisher.

Jack Sheinkman, Secretary-Treasurer, A.C.T.W.U.

Jerome J. Shestack, President, International League for Human Rights.

Gary Snyder, Poet.

I. F. Stone.

Rose Styron, Writer.

William Styron, Writer.

Lily Tomlin, Actress/Comedienne.

Peter H. Voulkos, Professor of Art, University of Calif. at Berkeley.

Grace Kennan Warnecke, Photographer.

Lina Wertmuller, Film Director.

Morris L. West, Writer.

Dr. Jerome P. Wiesner, President, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Jamie Wyeth, Artist.

Peter Yarrow, Entertainer.

Charles W. Yost, Special Advisor, Aspen Institute.

(Titles and/or affiliations listed for identification purposes only. No organizational endorsements implied.) ●

#### CONTINUING CRISIS IN FOSTER CARE

#### HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, once again the foster care system has been heavily criticized as the result of an indepth investigation by child welfare professionals. A recent study by the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services has found that too many children are in foster care, that too few services are offered both before placement and afterward in order to minimize removals or their duration, and that re-

views of placement are inadequate or nonexistent.

A substantial number of children maintained at taxpayer expense in foster care, the report concludes, could and should be adopted. Even were these children adopted with a subsidy, a number of State experiments have found, the overall cost to the public is far less than long-term foster care.

There is a certain dizzying sense of déjà vu in reviewing this Illinois report. Nearly 4 years ago, when I first opened the investigation into problems in the foster care system in the United States, a good deal of my education came from several reports and lawsuits in the State of Illinois. Since that time, the problems which were first identified have been associated with the foster care programs in every State which has been studied.

And there have been so many studies! In this year alone, the Children's Defense Fund, the National Commission on Children in Need of Parents, and several other independent organizations have issued studies of the foster care system which have come to virtually identical conclusions and policy recommendations. In recent years, the list of studies with similar results is exhaustive: the General Accounting Office, the Department of HEW, the New York City Comptroller's Office, the Regional Institute of Social Welfare Research, and many more have all studied this system and found it universally wanting.

Building on these studies, several States have begun to reform their State laws along the lines unanimously endorsed: Better preventive and reunification services; improved accountability and procedural requirements; mandates for appropriate placement; and subsidized adoption for children who would otherwise remain indefinitely in foster care.

In almost all cases, these alternatives have not only worked, but have saved significant amounts of money over the traditional system. Little wonder that child welfare professionals, lawyers, children's advocates, program administrators, foster parents, and judicial organizations, and many, many others have joined forces in demanding that the Congress reform the antiquated, wasteful, expensive, and destructive Federal foster care program.

There is legislation to do this. H.R. 3434 will soon be before the House of Representatives. It deserves, and has won the bipartisan support of the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee. Two years ago, similar legislation passed this House by a 5-to-1 margin: H.R. 3434 deserves at least such a vote of support. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this overdue legislation when it comes before the House, and in doing so, communicate the urgency of this reform plan to the Senate.

The importance of this legislation can be judged by the broad support it has already received, including the endorsements of: The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; American Home Economics Association; Association of Junior Leagues (on title



II); Child and Family Justice Project, National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA; Children's Defense Fund; D.C. Office of the County of Los Angeles; Family Service Association of America; National Association for Retarded Citizens; National Association of Counties; National Conference of Catholic Charities; National Council of Jewish Women; National Governors' Association; and Women's Division, Board of Global Ministries, United Methodist Church.

Equally telling is the virtual absence of opposition to its enactment.

The latest report from Illinois is yet another mandate to this Congress to speed enactment of this legislation. I want to share a newspaper summary of that report, because I think it details the immediacy of acting on this legislation which is so evident to those of us who have spent years working on behalf of these changes:

#### DCFS RIPPED ON PLACING CHILDREN

(By Michael Anderson)

Hundreds of Cook County children have been taken from their families by the state Department of Children and Family Services because their parents are indigent, according to a secret DCFS report obtained by The Sun-Times.

Instead of a short-term arrangement before parents are rehabilitated or the children are adopted, the report said, foster care has become a dumping ground. DCFS has failed "over a decade to provide adequate social services to families or to even contact the parents of children in foster care," the report said.

The report, written by Carole J. Alexander, assistant to the DCFS deputy operations director, was based on a review of case files of the 1,399 DCFS wards in Cook County aged 13 or younger who had been in foster care at least two years. Of the agency's 14,341 Cook county wards, 5,561 are in foster care.

Major findings of the report include: Children have been labeled "neglected" or "dependent" and taken from their families simply because the parents were indigent. "Problems arising as an outgrowth of the socioeconomic status of the parents were most frequently cited as the reasons for placement," the report said. "Many of the parents were victims of generations of poverty and the attendant problems therein, e.g. inadequate housing, a lack of education, marital strife. . . ."

"A crisis situation related to the problems described above nearly always precipitated placement" of children into foster care, the report said.

It recommends that DCFS seek authority to make cash payments to families temporarily unable to care for their children instead of taking parents to court and labeling them "neglectful."

DCFS caseworkers failed to document their decisions to take children from their parents. Children were placed on the basis of "caseworker subjectivity, ambiguity, stale information and third-hand accounts," the report said.

"The factual aspects of the crisis which precipitated a decision to remove the child from his family were seldom clearly described or characterized in the case recording," the report said, raising "questions about the appropriateness of such decisions."

"Hundreds of children may have been removed precipitously and subsequently have not received the care and services promised or mandated by statutes and policy," the report said.

DCFS caseworkers "had no plan for many of the children" and were content to let them remain in long-term foster care. The

report also charged caseworkers make no plans for either the rehabilitation of natural parents or adoption of the children.

Although the reviewers found that only 215 of the 1,399 children should remain in foster care rather than return to their natural home or be adopted, case files showed plans for 550 children to remain in permanent foster care, with an additional 330 to remain in foster care "until some unspecified time in the future when the plan would become adoption."

The report also said one-fourth of the children had not seen a caseworker for one to five years. Twelve per cent of the cases didn't even have a caseworker assigned, it added.

Parents were prevented from seeing their children by DCFS after their placement in foster care. "Only 12 per cent of the children saw their parents weekly or monthly," the report said. In more than 60 per cent of the cases, there was no evidence that the children had seen their parents at all since entering foster care.

The report said some caseworkers discouraged parental visits. "There was considerable evidence of bias against what was characterized as the 'crazy life-styles' of many natural parents."

Natural parents frequently were ignored by DCFS after their children went into foster care. Nearly half the parents of children put into foster care had no contact with a DCFS caseworker after the child was placed.

Eighty-five per cent of the parents, involving 1,185 children, were receiving no social services whatever. In the majority of cases, the department also failed to offer any help to the family to prevent placement of the children, the report said.

The department's failure to provide services for natural parents, or even to get in touch with them, has been a "major factor in perpetuating the children's stay in long-term foster care," the report said.

DCFS caseworkers failed to find families for adoptable children. The report said 126 children who were legally free for adoption had remained in foster care an average of five years. For 75 of these children, the foster parents had expressed interest in adoption, but the caseworkers have taken no action after "periods as long as 10 or 12 years."

The report said 57 per cent of the children in foster care should have been adopted, but their caseworkers instead intend for them to remain in foster care until their 21st birthday.

"The majority of caseworkers," the report says, "did not know how to develop or implement permanent plans" for children in foster care.

Child-care agencies have done as bad a job as the state in getting children into permanent homes. Private agencies from which DCFS has purchased care for children "have failed to take affirmative, aggressive and timely action to ensure that these children were moved into permanent family living arrangements," the report said.

Private-agency social workers were as guilty as DCFS caseworkers in not obtaining adoption for children and letting them remain in long-term foster care, the report said.

The report noted that private agencies made their money through continued foster care and, thus, were not economically disposed to work toward other, more permanent living arrangements for the children.

DCFS caseworkers are untrained, unknowledgeable and virtually unsupervised: "A significant number of caseworkers do not know what they are supposed to do," the report said. Many of them told the reviewers that making case plans for foster children was something to be done if they "had time."

Others did not know "how to develop or implement plans on behalf of children for whom they had responsibility."

High-level officials appeared to give "no consideration . . . to rewarding excellent work or of taking a disciplinary or corrective action in instances where policy or administrative directives had been ignored."

Foster caseloads are inflated with inactive cases. The report noted that caseload size varied from 25 to 85, and that "a number of caseworkers and several supervisors . . . acknowledged that their caseload or those of their subordinates were inflated with inactive cases." The report said it identified 150 inactive cases that were listed as open in DCFS files.

DCFS staff, at all levels, needs to be educated for their jobs. The report recommends that DCFS caseworkers as well as administrators and supervisors "be provided re-education and training relative to their role and responsibility."

The report also recommends periodic review to spot children who should be returned home and training of both state and private agency caseworkers in procedures for adoptions.

The report has been ordered delivered Tuesday morning to Circuit Court Judge Joseph Schneider. He is hearing arguments on his order that DCFS join with the Department of Mental Health to provide care for children previously rejected by both departments.

DCFS attorneys have contended that compliance with the order would cause "administrative and fiscal problems." Opposing attorney Patrick T. Murphy, representing the Juvenile Court, who has not seen the report, said he believes it shows the department squandered funds by needlessly taking children from their homes.

The report, prepared last year, has been so closely guarded within the department that even the new director, Gregory L. Coler, said he has not received a copy, although he has made two requests for it.

However, the DCFS head for Cook County, Howard Peters, said his staff has reviewed the report and is working to implement its 47 policy recommendations. ●

#### LEVERETT "SALTY" SALTONSTALL

#### HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1979

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, a great American left our company, and he will be sorely missed by all of us who aspire to his level of public service.

Last Sunday, Leverett Saltonstall, the former Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and an 18-year veteran of the U.S. Senate, passed away.

Although he came from the opposite side of the aisle, Salty, as he was called by his friends, epitomized the very best in American politics. He was the model of civility and humanity, and a credit to all of us fortunate enough to have known him.

He was a gentleman's gentleman, a gracious and grand man, whose soft-spoken manner belied the intensity of his commitment to the common weal.

In many ways, he was an exception to today's rule of brashness and noise, and of hollow promises and shallow commitments. He was an anachronism, in an age desperately in need of such anachronisms, a guiding light in a world of darkness and confusion, a public servant who took to heart his public trust.

To be sure, Leverett Saltonstall was a grand exception, and, again, he will be missed. And nowhere will his absence will be more felt than in Massachusetts' politics, where he energized our State's political process with his personality and demonstrated to the public what they should expect from their public servants.

This example that he set was his greatest contribution.●

#### CONFESSIONS OF A FAILED LIBERAL

### HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Alen J. Matusow, professor of history at Rice University in Houston, recently wrote a most provocative article, that both liberals and conservatives can learn from. I would like to bring this eloquent statement to my colleagues' attention:

#### CONFESSIONS OF A FAILED LIBERAL

New York Times columnist William Safire recently added to the lexicon of American politics the word "conservabil," defined as a liberal who belatedly realizes that "heavy spending in good times leads to bad times."

Safire's joke describes a current political trend of no small significance. Liberal intellectuals in droves have begun to recant their faith in the power of government to remedy defects in the social order. I know something of this trend. For I am one of that legion of intellectuals who called themselves liberals once but no more. This is my mea culpa.

I acquired my liberalism as most people acquire their religion—at my father's knee. Every step in my subsequent education only confirmed his precepts. An ardent New Dealer who sided with the dispossessed in all social struggles, he brought me up on the New Republic, shared with me his enthusiasm for liberal politicians and nurtured in me a social conscience.

In college in the mid-1950s, the best of my professors were good liberals, teaching that the root cause of American evils—monopoly, poverty, inequality—was unbridled capitalism. As a graduate student in history, I learned to view the American past as a struggle between the good guys and the bad guys in which the good guys were the people and the bad guys were the businessmen. In the highly politicized 1960s, by now a college professor myself, I picketed for civil rights, campaigned against Barry Goldwater, made speeches against the war in Vietnam and carried my liberalism into the classroom with a missionary's zeal.

As the intellectuals moved left through the decade, I moved with them becoming more anti-American with every revelation of our imperialism, racism and insensitivity to the poor. By 1970 I was, in Spiro Agnew's forgettable phrase, a "radical," a radical liberal who viewed correct politics as the path to social salvation.

Much of what I believed then I still believe. I still abhor racism, brood about poverty and regret American intervention in other people's wars. But I am no longer anti-American, in large measure because I have made my peace with American capitalism. In truth, I had only dimly grasped the rudiments of that system in the days when I counted myself its critic. I think that I understand it better now. With that understanding has come a growing conviction that on one crucial issue the conservatives were always right. The market is indeed a brilliant invention for allocating resources, maximizing liberty and increasing the standard of living of all classes. Further, interventions

to improve the results of the market will ordinarily fail their object.

I did not come to these views casually or by reading theoretical treatises on the virtues of capitalism. My real education commenced a few years ago when I undertook to write a history of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. Inevitably, much of my research focused on the measures promoted by these presidents to cure the ills of the economy and alleviate the sufferings of its victims.

I began with the hypothesis that liberal programs were fine as far as they went, but they had not gone far enough—hardly a novel view for a left-liberal like myself. In one respect, however, my approach departed from traditional political history, for I was less interested in the sound and fury of politics than in examining the concrete consequences of liberal reform.

As a result, I made an extraordinary and wholly unanticipated discovery. Except for civil rights, which touched the market only tangentially, nothing worked. It was not that the liberals had not gone far enough, but that the ideas they sponsored, enacted and administered were bad ideas. The effort of the 1960s to turn imperfect America into the Garden of Eden by passing laws had failed. I now think that it always will.

My personal odyssey from left to right may not be without general significance. Many other penitent liberals have come to revise their views in precisely the way I came to revise mine—through policy analysis. In me, then, writ small, the reader may observe a tendency gathering force in the American intellectual community. In the hope of illuminating that tendency, I offer from my research on the 1960s a few cases of liberal reform, cases which rocked my liberal faith to its foundation and opened a new chapter in my intellectual autobiography.

My first attempt at policy analysis was in many ways the most revealing. In 1961 President Kennedy inaugurated his career as a liberal reformer by urging Congress to raise the minimum wage from \$1.00 to \$1.25. Assuming that its purpose was to increase the income of the poor, I could quarrel only with the niggardliness of the proposal. If a 25 cent increase was good, would not 50 cents or a dollar be better?

Conservatives thought otherwise, of course. They argued that when legislation forces up the wage rate of marginal workers, marginal employers attempt to economize on labor by accomplishing the same work with fewer employees, replacing workers with machines, or closing down. In short, the minimum wage helps some poor people, but results in the unemployment of others. Convinced that conservatives were merely defending a class interest, I searched the literature for crushing refutation.

Though I found none, I did discover in the LBJ Library in Austin, Texas, a packet of memos, dated 1965, addressed to the President from the Council of Economic Advisers. Their subject was the minimum wage. It turned out that the President's economists, good liberals all, had precisely the same view in private that Milton Friedman had in public. Johnson should resist growing pressure to raise the minimum wage, the Council pleaded, because it would create unemployment and make it "harder for teenagers, unskilled, uneducated workers to find jobs. It would hurt many of those it was supposed to help." In the Council's view millions of inexperienced workers starting out in the labor force were "better off starting at \$1.25 than searching for work that is expected to pay \$1.75." A higher minimum said the Council, would "destroy job opportunities." Since 1965, an army of economists has constructed ever more complex models to confirm the view expressed by the Council in simple English.

Why, then, did Kennedy's bill pass in 1961, and why did Johnson ignore his advisers

and sponsor an increase in the minimum wage to \$1.65 in 1966? Who is really behind the minimum wage and why? Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers undertook to instruct him on the point, though he knew the answers better than they. "Union pressure—especially David Dubinsky of the textile workers is strong," the Council wrote. "The unions want to stop the movement of industry to the South by raising labor costs there." Unions were strong in the North, weak in the South. By taking away the South's wage advantage through minimum wage legislation, unions hoped to retard the migration of capital into the region. The Council pointed out that one consequence of impeding the South's industrial development would be to slow down the exit of her rural poor into industrial jobs. Though intellectually convincing, the Council's arguments were politically naive. Liberal presidents, even from the South, find higher minimum wages a small price to pay for the indispensable support of organized labor.

So began my loss of innocence. Not for the first time, I learned that in matters of the welfare state, the appearance of things is not always the reality. Conservatives warn against the hidden effects of liberal legislation. In the case of the minimum wage, the hidden effect is involuntary unemployment. Conservatives look for the special interest lurking behind every act of liberal benevolence. In this case the special interest manipulating liberal politicians and the gullible liberal public is union labor, whose real motive hardly accorded with my image of its altruism. Conservatives contend that unfettered competitive markets yield optimum social results. As I learned from the minimum wage, the underlying wage rate is set in a competitive labor market, whose social utility can be improved neither by legislative fiat nor, for that matter, by union monopoly.

At the crux of the debate between liberals and conservatives is the issue of competition. The conservative believes that competition still characterizes most markets and trusts it to discipline corporations in the public interest. The liberal regards competition as being illusory, or non-existent, and depends on government to prevent oligopolists from rigging markets and trampling the general welfare.

The appearance of things favors the liberal belief in oligopoly. In the crucial manufacturing sector, for example, 40 percent of all goods are produced in industries dominated by a few corporations. But as I learned from studying the famous 1962 duel between President Kennedy and the steel industry, appearances in this matter, too, can be deceiving.

John Kennedy and his economists believed in the existence of oligopolists and feared their power, especially over prices. If big corporations abused their power by jacking up prices, price stability could be shattered and inflation result. To keep the corporations on their good behavior, the Council of Economic Advisers published wage and price guideposts in January 1962. Wages should rise no faster than productivity, the Council said. Labor costs would then remain constant, and corporations would have no excuse to raise prices.

It just so happened that that spring, the steel industry and the steel workers were negotiating a new labor contract. "Steel hawks so large in the manufacturing sector of the economy," the Council told Kennedy, "that it can upset the price applecart all by itself." The President himself leaned on the workers to accept a noninflationary settlement. When they did, he was elated. All that remained was for the companies to honor an implicit bargain and hold the price line. But on April 10, 1962, less than two weeks after the new contract had been signed, Roger Blough, president of U.S. Steel, walked into the Oval Office and handed Kennedy a press



release announcing price increases averaging six dollars a ton. Bethlehem Steel and Republic immediately followed suit.

An enraged President thereupon bared the iron fist of the state and pounded the companies into submission. In a televised tongue-lashing, he denounced "a tiny handful of steel executives whose pursuit of private power and profit exceeds their sense of public responsibility." The Justice Department threatened an anti-trust suit. The Federal Trade Commission made noises about an investigation. The Treasury hinted that it might reconsider pending revision of depreciation guidelines for the steel industry. The Defense Department announced it would shift purchases away from the offending companies. And in the middle of the night, two FBI agents phoned reporters to obtain evidence damaging to the company's case. In the end Kennedy divided to conquer. On April 13 Inland Steel, a small but efficient producer, announced that it would not raise its prices. Bethlehem Steel, which shared the Chicago market with Inland, immediately rescinded its own increase. That afternoon Roger Blough met with emissaries of the President and surrendered. In liberal mythology Kennedy had vindicated the public interest against corporate greed.

In reading steel trade journals, I discovered that Kennedy's tantrum had been unnecessary. A few months after the showdown, in a soft economy, the price of steel actually slid below pre-crisis levels. In other words, even if Kennedy had done nothing, market forces would have repealed Blough's attempted increase. For, despite appearances, competition is the reality of the steel business.

American firms faced stiff competition from lower-priced foreign steel, from other structural materials (concrete, aluminum, plastics) and even from each other. List prices might be identical, but discounting was a fact of life in steel markets. Inland did not so much share the Chicago market with Bethlehem as compete for it.

The hypothesis of oligopoly, which had led to Kennedy's ill-considered guideposts, did not explain much about steel. In my view, it explains little about other so-called oligopolies as well. In adopting the hypothesis of competition, of course, I abandoned a vital tenet of liberal belief.

Medicare and Medicaid, enacted in 1965, is the ideal test case of liberal reform; because, without doubt, it is the most important, expensive and popular welfare measure enacted since the New Deal. Medicare provided persons 65 or over with both compulsory insurance to cover hospitalization, and voluntary insurance to cover physician and surgical fees. Medicare's companion program, Medicaid, approved by Congress almost as an afterthought, made medical payments primarily on behalf of welfare recipients regardless of age. By 1976 Medicare and Medicaid were spending \$32 billion on one-fifth of the population—one of every six dollars expended for medical services in the limited states. I have become convinced that the people are getting something less than their money's worth.

The hidden cost of Medicare and Medicaid was the tremendous acceleration in medical price inflation which they fueled. Medical inflation did not originate with these programs but with the spread, beginning in 1950, of private medical insurance, especially for hospitalization.

Hospital prices are the largest component (40 percent) of the medical price index. Prior to insurance, nonprofit hospital administrators had every incentive to keep costs down, because customers (i.e. patients) had to bear most of them. But insurance reduced the price of hospital services for the patient at the time he consumed them, thereby removing the chief barrier against cost pressures. Patients and doctors typically responded to lower net prices by demanding the best, or more accurately, the most expensive treat-

ment that other people's money could buy. Hospital administrators could now please doctors by buying the latest equipment, patients by adding amenities, workers by raising wages, trustees with grandiose visions by adding more beds—and pass on the added costs in the form of higher prices, increasingly paid through the painless mechanism of insurance. Insurance was the main reason why, between 1950 and 1965, hospital prices rose seven percent annually.

With the passage of Medicare and Medicaid, the population for whom someone else would foot medical bills stood on the verge of significant expansion. By the logic of the medical market place, medical prices were bound to inflate even faster. And they did. In the first years after Medicare, hospital prices jumped 14 percent and have continued to rise on the average 14 percent annually ever since. For different reasons, also related to Medicare and Medicaid, the rate of inflation in physicians fees more than doubled—from three percent in the year before enactment, to seven percent the year after.

Medicare not only increased the cost of medicine for society as a whole, but it also provided far fewer financial benefits for most old people than was commonly believed. For that small minority who had both long periods of hospitalization and small savings, Medicare was everything it was cracked up to be. But the average aged person was little better off. True, he paid a significantly smaller proportion of his medical bill out-of-pocket, thanks to Medicare, but his total bill was much higher. In 1976 Medicare beneficiaries directly paid an average of \$476 for medical services—in constant dollars, the same amount they spent in the year before Medicare's enactment. Aged persons not only had to buy drugs, eyes glasses and dental services, which Medicare did not cover, but they also expended increasing out-of-pocket sums for hospital and physicians care, which Medicare did cover. As every aged person can attest, Medicare is riddled with loopholes. The hospital deductible, for example, was only \$40 in 1966. Ten years later, it was \$104. Direct payments for physician fees increased from an average of \$66 to \$150 in the same period. Ironically, then, medical price inflation, caused by Medicare itself, partially washed away Medicare's benefits.

As for Medicaid, it is not entirely clear why Congress decided to bestow the blessings of this program on the poor. Most likely, Congress theorized that lack of income was a barrier to treatment. But the poor had not fared all that badly, thanks to the willingness of doctors and hospitals to dispense charity medicine. Before Medicaid, the hospital admission rate for families below \$3,000 was 107 per 1,000; for families with incomes above \$10,000, it was 89 per 1,000. The average poor person visited a doctor 4.3 times a year, while high income persons visited a doctor 5.1 times. Granted that the poor were frequently ill, these figures do not sustain a thesis of gross inequality. Still, if its purpose was to increase access to medical services for the poor, Medicaid succeeded. After its passage hospital admission rates for poor people climbed to 123 per 1,000, and poor people actually visited doctors more frequently than did the affluent.

The question is, were Medicaid's benefits worth the billions it cost and the inflation it helped generate? Not likely. Medicaid does not buy a better brand of service than the charity medicine had dispensed. In New York City only an estimated eight percent of the city's 10,000 doctors accept Medicaid patients. Fraud haunts the program. Medical entrepreneurs, often in so-called Medicaid malls, frequently bill the government for unnecessary or unperformed services, costing the state of New York, for example, an estimated \$250 million annually.

Medicaid created inequalities as well as reduced them. Benefits vary widely from state to state. Forty percent of the poor re-

ceive no benefits and 30 percent of Medicaid beneficiaries are not poor at all.

Finally, it is absurd on its face that nearly six of every 10 dollars spent on public assistance takes the form of Medicaid payments. Undoubtedly, the poor would rather have the cash.

In the end defense of Medicare-Medicaid relies on a simple equation: More medicine equals better health. The relationship is not obvious. Medical science could take credit for rapid declines in the death rate from 1930 through 1960 as a result of the development and rapid diffusion and anti-infectious drugs. Since 1960 few comparable breakthroughs have occurred, especially against the leading killers of this medical era—heart disease, cancer and stroke. Not surprisingly, efforts to uncover persuasive links between recent increases in the consumption of medical services and health have not succeeded. According to Victor Fuchs, a leading medical economist, "there is no evidence that Medicare has had a significant effect on the mortality rate of the aged."

Skeptics have even suggested that more medicine may equal less health. Certainly that is the view of a Senate committee which recently reported that American surgeons perform two million unnecessary operations a year with the resulting loss of 10,000 lives. Indeed, Medicare and Medicaid bestowed unambiguous benefits only on hospitals and doctors, who now receive payment for service once rendered for free.

The cases which I offer here do not constitute clinching proof against liberalism. They do, however, illustrate how much damage policy analysis can do to its premises. On the basis of my research, I can attest that similar analysis applied to other liberal measures generally yield similar result. But beyond the ineffectiveness of liberalism, there is philosophy. Here again I am persuaded that the conservatives were always right. The existence of a giant welfare bureaucracy, insulated from popular control, does violate democratic principle. The enactment of welfare measures to benefit some at the expense of others does depend on arbitrary coercion. Those who defend the market against the government do indeed defend our liberty.

But I do not call myself a conservative. Those who go by that name in America are guilty of a terrible contradiction. While they seek to deliver us from the welfare state with one hand, they would turn us over to the garrison state with the other. By some strange twist of history, conservatives have supplied the chief apologists for FBI black bag jobs, CIA snooping on American citizens, illegal wiretaps by so-called law enforcement officers, and presidential contempt for constitutional forms and liberties. It is primarily conservatives who justify every self-serving request of the military for new weapons systems and seem most willing to dispatch armies to solve international problems.

Until conservatives defend civil liberties as zealously as economic liberties and oppose the excesses of the national security as well as the welfare bureaucracy, I will remain a conservativist, waiting in the political wilderness for a movement based on consistent, thoroughgoing and intelligent opposition to the growing power of the State. ●

MRS. JULIA ESPEY HONORED

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, my fellow House colleagues, I want to take this opportunity to pay homage to a very

special lady in my hometown of Tuscaloosa, Ala.

The lady's name is Mrs. Julia Espey and last month she received the highest honor given by the Tuscaloosa Veterans' Administration Medical Center for her untiring and unstinting service to the patients at the institution.

One hundred and forty individuals and 60 organizations were honored at the annual volunteer recognition ceremony, but there was something special about Mrs. Espey's honor.

Mrs. Espey received a silver bowl from the institution in recognition of 10,000 hours of devoted volunteer service to our veterans.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I ask you to contemplate the enormity of her service. Ten thousand hours represents a full 250 weeks—or nearly 5 full years—of strictly voluntary service to her fellow man.

Why would someone give of themselves so unselfishly? Obviously, because she loves it and is a great and kind woman.

Mrs. Espey is an 84-years-young volunteer who comes to the center 3 days a week. She has been active in the volunteer program at the institution since 1950.

Presently Mrs. Espey serves in occupational therapy in the nursing home care unit and at the intermediate care unit. For many years she has been on the Voluntary Service Advisory Committee representing the American Legion Auxiliary.

I think Robert Dawson, Jr., the director of the medical center, perhaps put it best when he said of Mrs. Espey that she "is an inspiration to patients, staff, and other volunteers. Needless to say, she is a great asset to this center."

To that I can only add my own congratulations and thanks to this remarkable woman. ●

#### STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

#### HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleague's attention to a proposal by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to revise the eligibility requirements for the guaranteed student loan program (GSLP).

The Office of Education proposed on April 23 to change the eligibility requirements as they apply to foreign medical schools.

The proposed rules change would impose on the foreign schools restrictions it is doubtful could be met by American schools. The new regulations would require that at least 95 percent of a foreign school's American graduates pass on their first attempt the examination of the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this requirement is unnecessarily strict and is arbitrary in that it applies only to medical schools.

Every Member is aware of the great burden created by the costs of a medical

education. For the majority of Americans attending medical school abroad, the GSLP is the only means by which an education is possible.

At this time, I wish to submit for the RECORD my comments to HEW on the proposal. I would urge all of our colleagues to make known their views on this issue.

The letter follows:

JUNE 19, 1979.

MR. JOHN R. PROFITT,  
Director, Division of Eligibility & Agency  
Evaluation, Bureau of Higher & Continuing  
Education, U.S. Office of Education,  
7th & D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PROFITT: I would like to register my concern about the proposed new regulation regarding the eligibility of foreign medical schools under the Guaranteed Student Loan Program (45 CFR 149).

Although I can certainly appreciate the Office of Education's desire to ensure a high rate of repayment for GSLP loans, I do not feel that the new proposal addresses that desire in a just manner.

The new regulations would require that at least 95 percent of a school's American graduates pass on their first attempt the examination of the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates. This requirement seems arbitrarily strenuous.

In addition, these restrictions on Guaranteed Student Loan Program eligibility are placed only on foreign medical schools and not on other institutions.

The rigors of obtaining a medical education are well documented. The additional expense of doing so in a foreign country makes it imperative that these students receive Federal loan guarantees. Any revision of the program must be carried out in a judicious fashion.

With kind regards, I am  
Sincerely,

JOSEPH G. MINISH,  
Member of Congress.

#### TWELVE MILLION RETIRED AMERICANS JOIN THE FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION

#### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Task Force on Inflation gave me the opportunity to express my views on what is, without question, the No. 1 domestic issue facing Americans today—the nightmare of runaway inflation.

Inflation has plagued us so long now that many citizens question whether the problem can be dealt with at all. My own reply to the solution is a qualified "Yes." What must be made absolutely clear at the outset is that there are no "quick-fix" solutions. Inflation can only be dealt with effectively when approached in a gradual, responsible manner over a period of years through the exercise of fiscal and monetary discipline coupled with a tax and regulatory environment conducive to capital formation and productivity. And, even more important in the ultimate outcome of a successful war against inflation, in addition to the application of time-tested economic remedies, is a renewed moral and spiritual vision. I share with the noted German

economist, Wilhelm Roepke, the conviction that inflation is, at root, a moral disease and a spiritual illness.

The moral and spiritual dimensions of inflation are readily apparent, Mr. Speaker. In the past half century, the Federal Government has assumed a paternalistic role in our society by acting as man's "benefactor" in the name of compassion, humanitarianism, and egalitarianism. It has whetted the appetite of citizens for an increasing array of Government services and has sought to pay for them through increased taxes, repeated budget deficits, and the creation of fiat money. A generation of Americans has been weaned on the profligacy of paternalistic government. A state of dependency has spread across our land encouraged by some politicians who made, and continue to make, promises that cannot possibly be kept. The old philosophy of "tax-tax, spend-spend, elect-elect," of priming the pump to encourage spending, is now seen for what it literally is—a bankrupt philosophy. The fruits of this bankrupt philosophy—higher taxes, deficit spending, and an expansionist monetary policy—have encouraged a materialistic outlook of free and easy money on the part of both the public and private sectors with the result that citizens view themselves as "consumers" bent upon instant gratification rather than as producers. As a result, productivity and savings, the real wealth of a nation, have suffered. In addition, a government that views itself in paternalistic terms naturally assumes that it knows what is best for its citizens and that it can centrally plan and direct the intricate and manifold workings of a complex economy of 220,533,144 people.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, inflation, caused and sustained by the Government acts as "the opium of the people," throwing a veil of illusion and deceit over every human interaction. It confuses and deceives, raises expectations and hopes which are soon dashed, and ultimately sets the stage for economic anarchy, that which the English political theorist, Thomas Hobbes, aptly described as the "war of every man against every man." And then in order to restore some semblance of order, lo and behold, there eventually appears a modern economic Napoleon riding on a white horse. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the end of a free society.

What is absolutely imperative, then, if inflation is to be brought under control, is a return to the moral and spiritual vision of a Nation of free men, dependent not upon a paternalistic government, but upon their own self-reliance, self-discipline, and initiative—and, ultimately, upon divine providence. For it is instructive to note in this debate on inflation—where what is being inflated is our supply of currency—that upon each of our paper dollars and upon each of our coins is engraved the motto: "In God We Trust." We are, or should be, a humble people who place our trust not in an arrogant, paternalistic government but in the God of all.

I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to briefly mention two bills which I have



introduced and which, I believe, would go a long way toward successfully combating the fires of inflation. The first is the Federal Salary Control Act of 1979, which inversely ties the salaries of Members of Congress and top appointed Federal officials to the rate of inflation. As the rate of inflation goes up, our salaries go down. The bill calls for an elimination of the escalator clause which provides for automatic salary increases to offset inflation. In addition, before going into effect, the bill allows for a lowering of the inflation rate over a period of 2 years to 7 percent and a further lowering of the inflation rate over the subsequent 4 years to 2 percent per annum. Thereafter, salary increases are explicitly prohibited unless the inflation rate is kept at 2 percent or less for 2 consecutive years. There is also a floor of \$42,500 for Members of Congress and \$32,500 for appointed officials below which salaries cannot drop. I sincerely believe that the Federal Salary Control Act of 1979 is necessary, because it holds accountable those in high-salaried Government positions who are the chief architects of inflation. We, as public servants, should be setting an example of fiscal responsibility for the rest of the Nation. Anything less can only further undermine the people's confidence in representative government.

I have also introduced H.R. 3833, the Money Supply Control Act of 1979, which would decelerate the growth of the money supply (using M2) in a gradual, responsible manner over a 6-year period from between 8 and 9 percent in 1979 to 3 and 4 percent in 1984 and each subsequent year. Often overlooked in the efforts to curb inflation is the excessive growth in the money supply that is not in balance with the real productive wealth of the economy. What is being "inflated" in inflation is the supply of money—currency and bank credit—completely out of proportion to the real productive wealth of the economy; that is, the goods and services produced. It is shocking to learn that, in just the past 40 years since 1938, the value of the dollar has shrunk to 20 cents. In the same period, of course, there has been an awesome growth in the money supply. From 1940 to the beginning of 1978, there has been a 1,448-percent increase in the money supply. One thousand four hundred forty-eight percent. From 1972 to early 1978, the basic money supply known as M1 increased 31 percent while the Nation's output of goods and services went up only 14 percent, after discounting for inflation. If M2 is used as an index of measure, the rise during the same period has been even more alarming—63 percent. Keep in mind that money is supposed to be the symbol of the real wealth of the Nation.

The House Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs has recently, last March 12, issued a report which calls for a "steady deceleration in the average annual rate of monetary expansion over the next 5 years." In a recent speech, our distinguished colleague, Congressman PARREN MITCHELL, chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic

Monetary Policy, cogently articulated the case:

We do not need to be afraid of using monetary policy to promote economic stability by slowly reducing money supply growth until it is commensurate with the economy's long run potential to increase production.

I applaud that solid, logical approach.

Experience in recent decades suggests that a growth between 3 and 4 percent constitutes the tempo at which the American economy has been able to grow, given the various limitations. Thus, my bill would insure that the money supply would be gradually reduced to avoid high unemployment and to correspond with the real productive wealth of the economy. I have also chosen to use M2 rather than M1 as a more accurate gauge of the money supply in light of the advent last November of "automatic fund transfers" which enable depositors to use savings accounts in much the same way as checking accounts.

If unchecked, inflation, generated by irresponsible deficit spending and fueled by an expansionist monetary policy, will lead to increasing unstable economic conditions accompanied by, of course, increasing governmental controls—at the expense of our cherished liberties. We must avert such an ugly prospect while there is yet time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the remarks of a distinguished gentleman who offered a few remarks on behalf of my Money Supply Control Act of 1979, H.R. 3833. The distinguished gentleman is Prof. Ralph W. Borsodi, consulting economist to the American Association of Retired Persons and the National Retired Teachers Association.

The remarks follow:

#### THE CONTAINED AND CONTROLLED EXPANSION OF THE MONEY SUPPLY

My name is Ralph Borsodi. I am a consulting economist to the twelve million member National Retired Teachers Association/American Association of Retired Persons. With me today is James M. Hacking, the Associations' Assistant Legislative Counsel.

Our Associations are deeply concerned with the fact that within the past five years this country has had two bouts with double-digit inflation. The elderly are seriously injured by galloping inflation rates. As the purchasing power of their savings rapidly erodes away their dependency on government income support programs increases. The federal government and the states must assume heavier burdens in order to maintain the income of the elderly so that they may live out their lives in decency. The financial burden of the federal government has become so great that there are many who fear for the solvency of the social security system. Inflation must be brought under control.

It is obvious that new approaches are needed to contain inflation. It is also obvious that something is very wrong with the way we have been handling the growth of our supplies of money. We are here today to support Representative Robert K. Dornan's bill, the Money Supply Control Act of 1979, because we believe that the bill provides for a disciplined approach to the expansion of our money supply. Specifically, the bill provides for a gradual, rather than a sharp reduction, in the expansion of the money supply over the next five years. This should avoid any sharp recession.

At the end of this period of gradual reduction in the rate of money supply growth, the expansion of the money supply would then

be tied to the rate of growth in real gross national product (GNP). We believe that an orderly and restrained money supply growth process will be a great improvement over the present "stop-and-go policies" of money expansion and the undisciplined use of money supply growth to "whip up" periodically the national economic growth rate.

#### The 1970's: Economics in disarray

The 1970's have been termed by many economists as the decade of economics in disarray. It was thought impossible to have recession and inflation before the 1970's. We were, however, introduced to stagflation in 1975 and 1976, when we had both recession and advanced rates of price inflation.

Many of our other economic verities have also disappeared into limbo. Both domestically and abroad the economic scene has become chaotic and very difficult to interpret. We believe that much of this chaos dates back to the collapse of the Bretton-Woods agreement, when the dollar was cut loose from gold in 1971. Gold backing, although limited, created some discipline against the expansion of the supplies of the dollar. The expansion of supplies of the dollar during most of the 1970's has been conducted with an eye to liberally lubricating the U.S. economy, and with little regard to inflationary price effects. We are learning again that a fiat currency, or one that many call a paper currency, is a currency which is very difficult to handle; invariably the quantity of money tends to expand excessively. We believe the economic disorder of the 1970's is in great measure due to the undisciplined expansion of the supplies of the U.S. dollar.

If it seems that we are unfairly painting the decade of the 1970's as chaotic in the United States (and abroad), we would point out that the 1978 "Economic Report of the President" carried a detailed discussion of the "Origins of the Current World Economic Disorder." Cited as the principal sources of disorder were prolonged inflation, rising unemployment and large current account imbalances. While the report cites the strong expansionary policies existing everywhere in 1972, the rising rates of inflation were attributed to non-monetary factors: the demand for raw materials and grains during the early years of the decade, OPEC's quadrupling of crude oil prices in 1973, and the wage/price momentum which had become institutionalized in the economies of many industrialized states. The Council of Economic Advisors, which prepared the report, has, in our view, however under-estimated the contribution that overly expansive monetary policy has made to the economic instability of the 1970's.

#### Restoring economic order

We believe that the fundamental cause of economic disorder of the 1970's has been the lack of stability of the U.S. dollar. Our economy revolves around exchange and long term investment. When the unit of exchange and the unit in which long term investment is gaged lacks stability the foundations of the economy become shaky.

The philosophy that money does not matter, only employment matters, is a totally inadequate philosophy. Both money and employment matter. Private sector employment heavily depends on the willingness of the private sector to invest in new enterprise. This becomes hazardous when high inflation rates make return on investment difficult to calculate. The sickness of our stock markets is no accident. Investors are, also unwilling to commit funds at reasonable interest rates for new investment, when high inflation rates may create losses for them.

The dollar needs to be stabilized to restore order. Since we have a fiat currency, standards must be established for expanding the

money supply. The standard we should use is the real national economic growth rate.

A simple comparison between the growth of M1 money stock and the growth of real GNP reveals that in the first two decades after World War II M1 grew at a slower rate than real GNP. However, for the 9 years from 1967 through 1976, real GNP grew at an annual rate of only 2.6, while the money stock grew at a 5.8 percent annual rate. The mathematics are that we have been excessively expanding the money supply during the 1970's.

We believe that if we are to restore economic order the annual growth rate of the money supply should be no greater than the real growth rate of gross national product. And this we understand is the intent of the Money Supply Control Act of 1979, following a period of years gradually reducing the past expansion rate.

*Will reducing the money stock growth rate bring on recession?*

Business fears what it does not know. A known future reduction in money supply and credit is information to which business can adjust. A sharp braking of money expansion and credit may create business situations to which the private sector cannot adjust. But gradual slowing of the money supply growth rate should not produce a sharp recession.

A Chart of Money Stock changes for the period 1954 to 1979 is attached to the testimony we will file with you. Slow-down in money expansion in late 1955, mid-year 1962, mid-year 1965, late 1971, and early 1976 did not produce recessions. Abrupt declines in money stock invariably point to a period of recession or depression. Such declines were associated with the recessions of 1957/58, 1960, 1970 and 1974.

Since the rate of money supply expansion should be only gradually reduced to avoid recession, The Money Supply Control Act of 1979 properly argues for a five year period within which to accomplish this gradual reduction. The deceleration would take place in the M-2 money aggregate at the rate of 1 per cent a year, until the expansion rate approximately equaled the real rate of increase in GNP. Our previous testimony before the Banking Committees of both houses urged a deceleration of the growth rate in money supply in terms of the M-1 aggregate, of approximately 1 per cent a year, until the expansion again equaled the figure of the growth in real GNP. This testimony was supported by detailed econometric studies of the growth of money stock and of inflation. We are providing for the record our detailed testimony on this subject.

#### SUMMARY

We have attempted to outline in a very brief way the rationale for containing the expansion of the money supply and then controlling it, using the real GNP growth rates as the ultimate guideline. This subject has been studied at great length by the monetary economists and those particularly associated with the Chicago School of Economists. The economist, Milton Friedman, has established, beyond doubt, in his famous studies of "The Monetary History of the United States, 1867-1960" that—

"Throughout the near-century examined in detail we have found that:

"1. Changes in the behavior of money stock have been closely associated with changes in economic activity, money income and prices.

"2. The interrelation between monetary and economic changes has been highly stable.

"3. Monetary changes have often had an independent origin; they have not simply a reflection of changes in economic activity."

We must again assign to money its importance in guiding changes in economic activity.

TABLE 1.—Post-World War II trends in nominal and real gross national product and in money stock (M1 aggregate) 1947-77  
[All figures in billions]

	Nominal GNP	Money stock, M1 aggregate	Real GNP in 1972 dollars
1947-----	\$232.8	\$113.1	\$468.3
1948-----	259.1	111.5	487.7
1949-----	258.0	111.2	490.7
1950-----	286.2	116.2	533.5
1951-----	330.2	122.7	576.5
1952-----	347.2	127.4	598.5
1953-----	366.1	128.8	621.8
1954-----	366.3	132.3	613.7
1955-----	399.3	135.2	654.8
1956-----	420.7	136.9	668.8
1957-----	442.8	135.9	680.9
1958-----	448.9	141.1	679.5
1959-----	486.5	143.4	720.4
1960-----	506.0	144.2	736.8
1961-----	523.3	148.7	755.3
1962-----	563.8	150.9	799.1
1963-----	594.7	156.5	830.7
1964-----	635.7	163.7	874.4
1965-----	688.1	171.3	925.9
1966-----	753.0	175.7	981.0
1967-----	796.3	187.3	1,007.7
1968-----	868.5	202.2	1,051.8
1969-----	935.5	208.8	1,078.8
1970-----	982.4	219.6	1,075.3
1971-----	1,063.4	233.8	1,107.5
1972-----	1,171.1	255.3	1,171.1
1973-----	1,306.6	270.5	1,235.0
1974-----	1,413.2	283.1	1,214.0
1975-----	1,516.3	294.8	1,191.7
1976-----	1,692.4	311.9	1,265.0
30 yr. ave. an. growth rate (percent) --	7.1	3.6	3.5

M1 growth rates: 1947-57 -1.9 percent; 1957-67 -3.3 percent; 1967-76 -5.8 percent.  
Real GNP growth rates: 1947-57 -3.8 percent; 1957-67 -4.0 percent; 1967-76 -2.6 percent.

Date from various government sources as given in the 1977 Economic Report of the President.

#### CONGRESSMAN ROBERT F. DRINAN ADDRESSES NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

#### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the campaign for human rights in this country has not been confined to one particular segment of our society, nor to one particular religious denomination. At a recent meeting of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Congressman ROBERT F. DRINAN addressed the need for a concerted, coordinated effort by all people of goodwill to combat difficult humanitarian problems which transcend parochial borders.

At a colloquium on religious responsibility and human rights, Congressman DRINAN stated that:

Both Christians and Jews have dozens of reasons to link themselves together in an international organized body that will speak out on behalf of human rights.

For nearly 35 years the National Conference of Christians and Jews has played a major role in cementing con-

structive relations between these two great religious communities. I commend the remarks of Congressman DRINAN to the attention of our colleagues. The text of his address follows:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT F. DRINAN

Keynote talk given in New York City at the opening meeting on Monday evening, June 11, 1979.

Human rights is not really a new topic for the International Conference of Christians and Jews (ICCJ). At its very first meeting at Oxford University in 1946 the ICCJ outlined its philosophy of human rights with these words—particularly relevant in the year of the Nuremberg trials:

"The moral law which is rooted in God and implanted in man's nature is binding, not only upon individuals, but also upon society and all its groupings."

The ultimate premise of the ICCJ was also enunciated at Oxford in these words:

"As Christians and Jews we are firm on the basis of divine revelation that the dignity rights and duties of man derive from his creation by God and his relation to God..."

Those same convictions and that same consensus are apparent in the 10 points adopted by the ICCJ in Seelisberg in 1947 and in the 10 objectives agreed to in July, 1977 at the University of South Hampton in England.

There are echoes here of the meetings of the ICCJ in Vienna, Jerusalem and Hamburg but, I would suggest, that there is a challenge now for new horizons to be explored by the ICCJ.

The emphasis on human rights around the world now a part of American foreign policy may seem new since it is but three years old. But this policy has its roots in the 1948 United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and the covenant supporting that document.

The United States Congress has terminated aid to Argentina, Paraguay, Ethiopia, Chile and other nations because these countries will not implement internationally-guaranteed human rights.

All of this is encouraging but the ferment for fulfillment of human rights simply has to take on a deeply religious dimension. This is the reason why the conference of the ICCJ which begins this evening has primordial relevance at this time. Now is the time for an organized international drive on the part of Christians and Jews to broaden and deepen humanity's concern for human rights.

Christians and Jews have dialogued extensively in the past. Christians of all kinds have entered into ecumenical agreements and arrangements. Christians and Jews have come together on an episodic basis to fight for civil rights, to eliminate racism from our immigration policy and to terminate the war in Vietnam. But there is need of a continuous international group of Christians and Jews to make pronouncements, to teach, to scold and to inspire.

We have Amnesty International and the International Commission of Jurists based in Geneva. But the voice and the vision of believers is needed. We need the voice of those who believe that God has intervened in history. This is the unique bond which brings Christians and Jews together. They both believe that God himself intervened in human affairs when he spoke to Abraham. And together, Jews and Christians each day pray to and adore the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

Both Christians and Jews have dozens of reasons to link themselves together in an international organized body that will speak out on behalf of human rights. Christians should have the enormous guilt which comes from the repression of the Jews over 2000 years in a Christian culture—a series of



horrendous injustices that culminated in the Holocaust.

Jews in collaborating for the vindication of human rights are fulfilling every precious tradition in Judaism. They are deeply concerned—as we hope humanity is—about the fate of 70,000 Jews in Iran, the apprehensions of 118,000 Jews in South Africa and the deep concern for the future of the 300,000 Jews in Argentina.

Let us hope, therefore, that at last we will have a vibrant and dynamic international group of Christians and Jews speaking out on all of those moral issues on which together they have a profound consensus. They will speak out against genocide, against tyranny, against the escalating arms race but, even more importantly, they will speak out on three crucial issues all of which have enormous consequences for all of humanity. These three issues are: 1) global hunger, 2) the plight of refugees and 3) the protection of Israel by means of a growth in the global understanding of Zionism.

#### GLOBAL HUNGER

During the next 60 seconds 200 infants will be born into our global village. Only 100 of these 200 of our new brothers and sisters will live beyond the age of 5. Only 50 of them will live beyond the age of 15. Of the 50 survivors only 25 will be able to read and write.

In the year 2000, 4 out of every 5 human beings will be living in the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The Second Vatican Council stated in dozens of ways that a commitment to the poor and to the powerless is in our age a very effective and indeed an indispensable way of bringing about not merely justice, but also the possibility of faith. Pope Paul VI in his encyclical "On the Development of Nations" issued in March, 1967 reminded all of us of the responsibility that faces us in view of the global death of children, the misery of families and growing illiteracy, the prevalence of malnutrition and the tragedy of pervasive unemployment.

Unfortunately, things today are even worse than the Second Vatican Council and Pope Paul foresaw. In the last 5 years, for example, the billion people who live on incomes of less than \$200 a year are now more numerous and worse off than they were 10 years ago. It is not some revolutionary who tells us these things, but the President of the World Bank.

Listen to the voice of the 300 Catholic Bishops of Latin America in their final statement at the Puebla Conference in early 1979:

"From the heart of Latin America, a cry rises to the heavens ever louder and more imperative. It is a cry of a people who suffer and who demand justice, freedom and respect for the fundamental rights of man. In (the people's) pain and anxiety, the Church discerns a situation of social sin, of a magnitude all the greater because it occurs in countries which call themselves Catholic.

We identify, as the most devastating and humiliating scourge, the situation of inhuman poverty in which millions of Latin Americans live . . . To this situation of misery must be added the anxieties arising from abuses of power, typical of military regimes . . ."

Dom Helder Camara, Archbishop of Recife-Brazil, has pointed out why we must protest:

"When we are accused of neglecting our spirituality in order to perform political tasks we ask ourselves if it is not also political to continue to defend a pseudo-social order that conceals terrible injustices . . . Neutrality would be treasonous."

Very shortly, the Presidential Commission in Global Hunger, chaired by Sol Linowitz, will tell us all of these things one again. Hopefully the United States will seek to follow up the recommendations of the Com-

mission on Hunger established by President Carter. What we need—what all humanity needs—is the voice and the vision of the organized religious groups of Christians and Jews. We need that voice to enunciate the truths that certainly political rights are important, but economic rights are equally or even more important. The right to food and fuel and fertilizer is just as important as the right to participate in a political way in the country in which one resides.

#### A VOICE FOR THE FUTURE OF REFUGEES

If an International Conference of Christians and Jews had existed in the 1930's or even in 1942, perhaps the Holocaust might not have claimed the lives of 6 million Jews. The voice of the ICCJ could at least have told humanity that these threatened persons should be able to migrate to another nation.

We feel some pride that the United States is taking at least a moderate number of the Vietnamese "boat people." But our record over the last generation with regard to accepting refugees is not particularly generous. We have accepted 300,000 Cubans, 58,000 Hungarians, some 160,000 Vietnamese and about 40,000 Soviet Jews. But we still retain a ceiling of 250,000 immigrants who can come to the United States each year. That figure was established not after the Second World War but far back in 1920!

Americans who urge that all illegal aliens or undocumented persons be sent back to the country of their origin are doing nothing either to help those persons in their fatherland or to adjust the number of visas which America extends annually to foreigners.

Christians and Jews working together obtained in America the elimination of the racist features of the old Immigration Act. Now it is time for more radical surgery.

There are many indications that there may well be vast movements of refugees around the world in the next few years. In Bangladesh, 75,000,000 people reside in a country the size of Florida. By the year 2000 that number will have increased to 150,000,000!

There are other areas where the ICCJ must be strong. It must monitor and strengthen the Helsinki Agreement, it must assist the growth of Democratic institutions in Africa but, above all, it must explicate Zionism to all of humanity.

#### ANTI-ZIONISM IS THE NEW ANTI-SEMITISM

It is frightening to recall that in 1975 72 nations of the General Assembly of the United Nations—countries representing two-thirds of humanity—voted for a proposition that denounced Zionism as a form of racism.

This group, made up largely of third world nations, turned anti-semitism into anti-Zionism. Where did these third world countries learn anti-semitism? It was not from the Koran or from Buddhism or from Hinduism that they learned it but from the Christian nations. Anti-semitism apparently metastasized from Christian Europe into the third world.

The explication and defense of Zionism is one of the fundamental duties of the ICCJ and includes, of course, the defense of international support for Israel.

The United States Congress has given to Israel since 1973 over \$10 billion of economic and military assistance. The Congress is at this time processing additional authorizations for \$4.5 million in order to permit Israel to carry out the provisions of the Israel-Egyptian treaty.

Seven Presidents and 16 Congresses have fulfilled America's commitment to Israel but even that outstanding record could be altered and eroded unless Christians understand the unique role and mission of the nation of Israel.

If Jews and Christians desire to enhance humanity's respect for the nation of Israel, they must continuously seek to understand the faith of each other. The Second Vatican Council in 1965 finally condemned anti-

semitism, but the Council said nothing about the Holocaust, the establishment of Israel or Zionism.

Now is the time for Christians to begin to understand the history of Judaism. How few Christians have understood or even heard about the long isolation of Jews in Christian Europe from the year 300 to 1540? But with the Reformation the Jews half hoped that they would have some liberation but their hopes were in vain. From 1540 to 1800, the Catholics and Protestants of Europe disagreed on virtually everything except their common conviction that the Jews should continue to be isolated from the life of the nations where they resided. Even with the emancipation of the Jews around the year 1800 there began a period which, alas, ended in the crematoria of the Holocaust.

Christians will have to understand what Jacques Maritain said. These are the sentiments of this century's most famous Catholic theologian:

"The people of Israel are a unique people in the world because their land, the land of Canaan, was given to them by the true Lord, the only God above all, creator of the universe and of the human race . . . and what God has given once is given forever."

I had many reflections as I sat on the lawn of the White House on March 26, 1979 to witness the historic signing of a peace treaty between Israel and Egypt. I wondered if finally the Zionist dream would be fulfilled. Could we anticipate that in Israel at last there would be a really Jewish state, with Jewish poetry, Jewish literature, Jewish art and, yes, Jewish mysticism?

The work of Christians and Jews at the international level is to make certain that America's and humanity's commitment to Israel is not eroded. That commitment was spelled out by President Carter speaking to the Knesset on March 11, 1979 in these words:

"Seven Presidents have believed and demonstrated that America's relationship with Israel is more than a special relationship. It has been and is a unique relationship. And it is a relationship which is indestructible because it is rooted in the consciousness and the morals and the religions and the beliefs of the American peoples themselves."

Clearly, Christians will have to understand more the anxiety of Jews everywhere for the fate of the 3 million Soviet Jews. Thirty-four Christians attended the second Brussels Conference in 1976. As Golda Meir accepted the statements of this group of 34 Christians before a body of 1200 Jews from all over the earth, she spoke these words which had a profound effect upon me as I heard them from this elderly matriarch:

"We just refuse to disappear. No matter how strong and brutal and ruthless the forces against us may be—here we are. Millions of bodies broken, buried alive, burned to death. But never has anyone been able to succeed in breaking the spirit of our people."

Contemplate what Christians and Jews have done over the past nine years to liberate the Jews of the Soviet Union. Some 50,000 Soviet Jews will be able to emigrate this calendar year alone! If pressure on the Kremlin continues and no further tragic events occur within Russia, we may anticipate that what someone has called the last Exodus could bring over the next 3 to 5 years some 250,000 Soviet Jews out of the land of bondage.

Elie Weisel practically wrote the mission of the ICCJ when he proclaimed these sentiments:

"We cannot forget injustices . . . to forget is a crime against memory. Whoever forgets becomes the executioner's accomplice . . . we must tell, shake, awaken, alert, repeat over and over again without respite or pause, repeat to the very end those stories that have no end . . ."

Albert Camus, a non-Christian, told what he expects of those who follow Christ:

"What the world expects of Christians is that they should speak out, loud and clear, and that they should voice their condemnation in such a way that never a doubt, never the slightest doubt, could arise in the heart of the simplest man. They must get away from abstraction and confront the blood-stained face that history has taken on today."

The ICCJ was born in 1946 because Christians and Jews were revolted at the Holocaust. They could not believe that it had happened. They were aghast at what an overwhelmingly Christian nation had done.

Today, more than 30 years later—despite the establishment and glory of Israel—we still tremble when we consider the vast repression of human rights. During your deliberations here you will hear about violations of human rights in Chile, Indonesia, Rumania, South Africa and elsewhere. You will probe the depths of the theological, Biblical and mystical roots which link us together as Jews and Christians.

You will bear the thoughts of horror which a few days ago Pope John Paul II had as he prayed in the dungeon cells of Auschwitz. You will rejoice that a Pope for the first time in 35 years has visited the place where 2.5 million Jews perished.

I dream of wonderful things that will be forthcoming from this conference. I dream of a strong and vigorous international organization of Christians and Jews that will proclaim humanity's duty to bring bread to the hungry, to grant refuge to the refugees and to proclaim the rights of Zionists and the people of Israel.

On April 24, 1979 at an unprecedented ceremony on the Holocaust in the Ro unda of the Capitol in Washington, Elie Weisel gave a message which epitomizes everything that the ICCJ stands for. These are his words:

"We have learned not to be neutral in times of crisis, for neutrality always helps the aggressor, never the victim. We have learned that silence is never the answer. We have learned that the opposite of love is not hatred, but indifference . . .

"So let us remember, let us remember the heroes of Warsaw, the martyrs of Treblinka, the children of Auschwitz. They fought alone, they suffered alone, they lived alone, but they did not die alone, for something in all of us died with them." ●

#### POPE JOHN PAUL II'S VISIT TO POLAND

#### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my good friend and colleague from Wisconsin, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, CLEM ZABLOCKI, for taking this special order to recognize Pope John Paul's visit to Poland.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Pope's visit will be recorded in history as one of the most significant events of our time. For the former archbishop of a large industrial city inside an officially atheistic country to become the head of the Roman Catholic Church is indeed inspiring. His triumphant return to his homeland served to point out not only the tremendous faith of the Polish people—of whom 90 percent are Catholic—but also their unyielding struggle for self-expression.

While living under the rule of a totalitarian government, the Polish people passionately supported John Paul's challenge to the Polish Government not to restrict religious expression. I am sure it is not difficult for us to imagine that these same people would like to extend that challenge beyond religious expression—to provide for the kinds of basic freedoms which we in America take for granted: The freedom to speak, to write, to publish, and indeed to openly believe in something other than totalitarianism.

Mr. Speaker, our own commitment to fighting for human rights is equally as challenging when we consider the tragedies occurring around the globe. The devastating loss of human life in Southeast Asia is unconscionable. While the United States has tried to do our part to help these victims of repressive governments whom we call "refugees," it is incumbent upon us to do still more. We must assume the responsibility, and must put pressure on other countries to assume their responsibilities as members of the world community. We simply cannot allow these people to die. Nor can we ignore the people of Eastern Europe who cry out for help in emigrating from totalitarian states.

Mr. Speaker, Pope John Paul II's visit took a tremendous amount of courage and faith. It is my hope that the rest of mankind, inspired by the Pope's visit, can find the spiritual strength and courage needed to meet the pressing demands of our belief in human rights. ●

#### THE DRAFT: TEENS DON'T WANT IT

#### HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the passage by the Senate Armed Services Committee of a proposal to resume registration for the draft prompts me to once again express my opposition to such a proposal. It is unnecessary at this time, and it is certainly wrong to consider such a drastic step as a mere amendment to the defense authorization bill. If we are to reinstitute this system of supplying manpower to our Armed Forces, then let it begin only after a full, open, and public debate.

My colleagues who are supporting this registration proposal believe that this is not the first step toward a resumption of the draft. This belief is well-intended but totally incorrect. Even the highly respected National Journal, in an article on this subject, admits that "registration would be a meaningless process unless at some point the draft itself were revised."

So if we are to have a full public discussion about the draft, I want to be sure that those young men and women who might be drafted are included in the debate. In this regard, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter that appeared in the Contra Costa Times, a newspaper in my district. It is from a local high school student, and expresses well the feelings

of those draft-age youngsters who are opposed to this legislation. I commend this article to all of my colleagues:

DRAFT: TEENS DON'T WANT IT

(By Allison Dettmer)

The draft. For many teenagers and young adults that word offers frightening connotations. And rightfully so.

Currently Congress is considering legislation that would require draft registration of men and women, with possible inductions of men by the end of this year.

In a time when no military emergency exists and human needs remain unmet, it appears unnecessary to spend close to \$30 million for the registration and/or classification of young persons for possible conscription.

This revival movement is sparked, in part, by fears of the quality and quantity of the All Volunteer Army, AVA, and by fear the United States is losing its credibility in foreign dealings.

The draft is seen as a response to the Soviet military presence in the world. Currently there are 2.1 million active duty personnel and 1.1 million reservists, but this is not considered an adequate force.

To renew the draft would be an infringement upon personal and democratic freedom. Conscription is contrary to our country's principles; it is totalitarian, not democratic. The draft is leading to increased government regimentation and control over citizen's lives.

The House Armed Services subcommittee on military personnel is currently considering seven draft bills, one of which the full House Armed Services Committee is expected to bring to the floor of the House.

One of these bills, or a combination, will most likely be recommended and passed by the House.

Rep. Charles Bennett of Florida is proposing a bill, HR-23, which would require the president to order the Selective Service System to commence registration of young men this year.

It also calls for opening private and public school records to Selective Service. They would have access to tax information, social security records, drivers' license applications and such.

It would amend the Privacy Act to permit the Selective Service to have access to information in the records of any agency for the purposes of conducting registration.

The bill, HR-2404, calls for the registration of 18-year-old men and women, and the induction of up to 200,000 men only into the Individual Ready Reserve each year.

Congressman Paul McCloskey of California is proposing a bill which would give the 17-year-old registrant a year to consider four options: two years of active military service, with educational benefits; six months of active duty followed by five and one half years of Reserve obligations; one year of civilian service; or placement in a pool of potential draftees for six years.

The option of signing up for civilian service has a certain appeal, but it contains some problems.

Refusing to be in active military service, many young adults will gladly volunteer for a national service. These national service workers could create cutbacks in other social service programs and displace employed workers.

A good question has risen in an article "Greetings You're About to be Drafted," "How many \$10,000 per year church custodians will find themselves replaced with \$3,000 national service workers?"

People who support the draft say you should love your country enough to defend it, and the United States must have something to defend itself if no one else is listening.

For youth it doesn't seem to be a question of fighting for one's country, it is more a fact



that the youth do not want to serve the government.

A recent Harris poll shows 47 percent of those between the ages of 18 and 29 opposing registration.

Particularly for high school students it is presenting a disruption of their lives and future plans.

Many young people feel we should have learned from Vietnam. One teenager feels since we are no longer in any active warfare, the increase in the army will be creating a facility for its use.

If a war would break out, an 18-year-old sees that nuclear weapons will be used. "Hand to hand combat would be virtually impossible. Why build up a large army?"

Many teenagers seem to feel that no one has a right to fool around with a life, which is presently what the government is trying to do. "I personally cannot kill anyone. I don't feel I have a right to take a life."

The budget which President Carter submitted to Congress Jan. 22 would increase military spending more than \$10 billion. The proposed budget places military spending at \$138.8 billion as opposed to expenditures of all public schools at \$116.9 billion.

One of the problems the pro-draft people complain about concerning the All Volunteer Army is that only the poor and minorities are volunteering, an estimated 42 percent.

They feel the draft will create a cross-section of people represented in the army. However, with compulsory enlistment the upper class, wealthy and educated will be able to resist. It will still be the poor who have no choice.

Perhaps the millions of dollars used for implementing the draft could be used to eliminate unemployment and poverty which pushes the minority into the army for a decent life.

Money should be used to improve the quality of life available to persons who volunteer for the armed services. Young people would be volunteering if it had something to offer.

Editor's note: Alison Dettmer is a junior at Pleasant Hill High School. She has been participating in the CCT-2 program which is a joint project sponsored by the Contra Costa Times and County Regional Occupational Programs. Its purpose is to give high school students realistic job insight and training.●

#### JUSTICE FOR WELBY LEE

#### HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the area of Kentucky in which I grew up has long been noted for the tenacity of its people. That persistent pursuit of purpose is a characteristic in which we take pride, for often it is the one quality which produces results.

A recent article in the Louisville Courier-Journal chronicled the special tenacity of a man from my hometown, Mr. Welby Lee, in seeking justice.

This article shows how one man can do the impossible, so long as he has right on his side, and I offer it for the RECORD:

ONE MAN'S SEARCH FOR JUSTICE BECAME A JOURNEY OF 20 YEARS  
(By Byron Crawford)

TOMPKINSVILLE, KY.—At 3:55 p.m. on New Year's Eve, 1944, time may as well have stopped for Welby Lee of Tompkinsville. For never, since that moment, have things been the same for him or his wife, Lina.

It was a stormy afternoon near the Kentucky-Tennessee border, where Welby's father lived.

His "pappy," as Welby called him, had crossed the highway to fix a barn door latch. Mildred Casteel, Welby's 16-year-old niece, was working in the kitchen when she heard a car hit something, and, thinking it was the dog, looked out the window.

Two men were getting out of a black coupe, talking excitedly. One was tall, slim, a bit stoop-shouldered, with black hair that lay smooth and was combed straight back.

The other had lighter hair, was not as slim, but about the same height, and wore a gray, medium-length jacket.

When Mildred stepped out the door, the men jumped into their car and sped off toward Tompkinsville.

In the ditch lay Welby's father, Newt Lee, bruised, broken and barely alive. He died a short time later, before they could get him to a hospital. The impact had thrown him 65 feet, and the car appeared to have swerved off the shoulder before hitting him.

Even before the funeral, Welby, who was then 31 years old, began trying to find who had struck his father and left him in the ditch to die.

A year went by, and another. Welby sold his partnership in what promised to be a prosperous lumber business to devote more time to finding his father's killer.

Up every holler, down every road, into every general store, he was asking questions about that day: Did anybody remember two strangers in a black '38 or '39 model coupe? Several said they'd seen them; a store operator said they'd been drinking.

Welby's only shred of tangible evidence was a chrome bumper guard, which he believed came off the death car. It had been found near his father's body.

A woman at a parts house in Tompkinsville had remembered selling it to a slim, dark-haired man, but she didn't know his name and did not remember seeing him before or after the sale.

Another year went by. Welby tried to enjoy himself playing baseball, one of his favorite pastimes. But constantly while on the pitcher's mound or in the field, he found himself gazing at the bleachers for a slim, stoop-shouldered man who combed his black hair straight back.

His days and many of his nights were spent asking questions, checking out leads dispelling rumors about who might have done it, leaving no stone unturned in a 50- to 75-mile radius of Celina, Tenn., near where his father was killed.

Welby never stopped asking questions, and many sleepless nights were spent wondering how to proceed.

In 1958, 14 years after it happened, he got the first good clue: A California woman who once had lived in Tennessee told him that she believed her brother-in-law, a man named Jones, had done it.

He'd lived in Ohio then, she told him, and was living in Indianapolis now, divorced from her sister.

On that night 14 years earlier he and a friend, who also lived in Ohio, but was back in Tennessee visiting kinfolks, had been out together in Jones' '38 black Ford coupe, drinking quite heavily. Jones had come to his relative's home, she remembered, and ordered the family to get ready to return to Ohio that night, even though they'd planned to be in Tennessee several more days.

He'd gotten real upset, the woman said, and told his wife he was in serious trouble. She'd noticed he'd taken the license plate off the car.

Welby spent a long time looking into the Jones family: relatives, in-laws, Jones' fellow workers and neighbors in Ohio. Some reluctantly confessed their suspicions that

he might be guilty, recalling statements he'd made while drinking that he'd killed a man in Tennessee.

In early 1962, Welby Lee traveled to Indianapolis and met the man named Jones face to face.

"Considering how many years it had been, he looked almost as I had expected," said Lee.

He and Jones shook hands, he recalls, "and I told him I was Welby Lee, whose father had been killed by a hit-and-run driver in 1944. His color seemed to change two or three times in the few seconds we stared at each other. . . . Tears welled up in his eyes."

"After all the many years of searching," said Welby, "I felt sorry for him at this moment, even though he had killed my father."

Ironically, Jones would never admit that he was driving the car that struck Newt Lee, even though Welby promised him he would not push for an indictment if he would be honest about what he had done.

The man alleged to have been Jones' companion when Newt Lee was killed also denied it all; denied knowing Jones, denied being in Tennessee . . . everything.

Jones threatened Welby Lee with lawsuits, and there were even threats of physical violence against him in the months that followed. But Welby, after so many years, wasn't about to stop now.

In August 1965, after a lengthy extradition from Indiana and a mistrial in Tennessee, a jury finally gave Jones a year and a day in prison for the involuntary manslaughter of Newt Lee. Welby had amassed such an overwhelming stack of evidence in the form of personal testimony from those who had seen Jones and another man drinking together, and overheard talk from the two men about what they had done, that the jury could draw no other conclusion.

Welby had devoted night and day to tracking down his father's killer, and now it was over.

"I don't have any desire to prosecute the passenger in the hit-and-run car at this time," said Welby. "He has a job, and a family."

Since the case was closed, hundreds of people have asked Welby Lee how he managed to stick with it so long.

A few of the answers are contained in a 240-page book, Welby's first-person account of the case from start to finish. It's titled: "It Took A Worried Mind."●

#### THE DECONTROL OF OIL

#### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I very well understand the strong sentiment favoring the retention of price controls on oil. It is an essential commodity. It is often argued that if oil is left to the free play of market forces, the price will rise. The price will then be too high, and only the rich will be able to afford oil or petroleum products such as gasoline. In effect, the less fortunate will be at a disadvantage in the marketplace.

It is sometimes argued that the maintenance of price controls will keep the cost of living from rising and will ease the burden on consumers in an inflationary economy. The tacit assumption underlying the two related arguments is, of course, that there is something inherently sacred about the market price of oil at the time that the Nixon adminis-

tration froze American crude prices in 1971.

While I sympathize with the sentiments of those opposed to decontrol and concede the emotional appeal of their arguments, I cannot honestly accept them. Virtually every argument advanced against the decontrol of American oil neglects the vast changes taking place in the conditions of production and the rate of demand. By artificially holding down the price of oil well below the market level, we will bring about results directly opposite of what we all wish to achieve.

First, we will artificially stimulate the demand for crude oil, petroleum products, and gasoline. Consumers can, and will, continue to buy more oil products than they would otherwise. In other words, we will discourage the conservation that virtually everyone, in both parties, agrees that we desperately need. We have had a taste of the hardship of long gasoline lines in California. We do not need to aggravate the problem on a national scale. I have yet to hear one economist deny that price controls encourage consumption.

There is a second and related problem. Price controls create and aggravate shortages. We will decrease the relative supply of available, domestic crude oil and petroleum products, that is, relative to what we would have otherwise enjoyed. Why? Because by holding down the prices to an artificially low level, a level dictated by Richard Nixon in 1971, investors will hesitate or refuse to increase their investments in the domestic oil industry. A lower rate of return on investment will discourage new investments in accelerated exploration and development of crude oil here in the United States.

Total oil research and production will require an estimated \$1.4 trillion between now and 1985. The big oil companies, international operations such as Exxon, Mobil, Texaco, or Standard of California, are not greatly hurt by the price regulations. It is the small, independent, wildcat drillers who are most adversely affected. These independents drill about 90 percent of all exploratory wells in the United States. An on-shore well may cost as much as \$6 million to drill, an off-shore well \$60 million. The capital investment in oil exploration and production is tremendous, as are the risks.

Five out of six exploratory wells are "dry" and only one in 50 is now reckoned a commercial success. It is worth noting that half of all the crude oil produced in California is produced by independent oil operations. In their anger at the international oil companies and OPEC, I find it remarkable that some public officials want to take punitive action against our own, independent, domestic producers. With price controls, marginal producers are often driven out of the market. As a result, we will end up limiting the essential supply of our oil. I cannot believe that this is what opponents of decontrol have in mind. Not after the experience in California.

We must increase our oil supplies until we achieve breakthroughs in alternative forms of energy. I have met no one in public life, including opponents of decon-

trol, who argues that the decontrol of oil will not result in an increase of oil supplies. The question is simply how much we will increase those supplies. The President says that by 1985, we will, under decontrol, be producing an extra 740,000 barrels per day. A Chase Manhattan Bank econometric study puts the figure at 900,000 barrels per day. Private industry estimates 1.3 million barrels per day, an optimistic projection. The most conservative assessment is that of the Congressional Budget Office which predicts an increase of 405,000 extra barrels a day by 1985. It is reliably estimated that we could cut the cost of imported oil in 1985 by as much as \$10.2 billion.

We must reduce our imports of foreign oil, which are fixed by the OPEC cartel leaders at artificially high prices. Importing as much as 50 percent of our oil requirements, the United States, now more vulnerable than ever, is the world's greatest oil importing Nation. As the President said in his November 8, 1977, address to the Nation, excessive importation of foreign crude is a drain on our economy, injuring our balance of payments, weakening the value of our dollar, dampening investment and contributing to domestic unemployment. This outflow of dollars, now approaching a staggering \$50 billion, is expected to grow. We must curtail that outflow of dollars. By the administration's calculations, every \$5 billion increase in oil imports costs the United States 200,000 American jobs. Our failure to increase our domestic supplies, along with alternative forms of energy, is, in effect, a subsidy of the OPEC cartel.

I have been an outspoken opponent of most of President Carter's domestic and foreign policies, but on this issue of oil deregulation he is right on target. Free enterprise is still the best economic system devised by mankind. ●

## YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, following are the copies of two bills which I introduced today dealing with the subject of youth employment, a matter of critical concern for our Nation.

The material follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act to provide for the eligibility of certain in-school youth for, and for the certification and referral of such youth to, jobs under the targeted jobs tax credit program.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) Section 51(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the amount of credit for employment of certain new employees) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED YOUTH.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'economically disadvantaged youth' means any individual—

"(1) who is certified by the designated local agency as—

"(I) meeting the age requirements of subparagraph (B), and

"(II) being a member of an economically disadvantaged family (as determined under paragraph (9)); and

"(II) who is certified by a prime sponsor under section 113 of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act as—

"(I) meeting the age requirements of subparagraph (C),

"(II) being in regular attendance at a public or private elementary or secondary school, and

"(III) being a member of an economically disadvantaged family (as determined under paragraph (9)).

"(B) GENERAL AGE REQUIREMENTS.—An individual meets the requirements of this subparagraph if such individual has attained age 18 but not age 25 on the hiring date.

"(C) IN-SCHOOL YOUTH AGE REQUIREMENTS.—An individual meets the requirements of this subparagraph if such individual has attained age 16 but not age 19 on the hiring date."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after September 30, 1979, in taxable years ending after such date with respect to individuals who are first hired after such date.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 103(a) of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (20) and (21) as paragraphs (21) and (22), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (19) the following new paragraph:

"(20) include a description of the arrangements entered into under section 113 for the certification of in-school youth for jobs under the targeted jobs tax credit provisions of section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;"

(b) (1) Part A of Title I of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act is amended by adding after section 112 the following new section:

### "CERTIFICATION OF IN-SCHOOL YOUTH

"Sec. 113. (a) Each prime sponsor, upon the application of any individual who meets the requirement of section 51(b)(3)(A)(II) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, shall provide to such individual certification of such eligibility and shall refer such individual to employers who have notified the prime sponsor of their willingness to participate in programs of employment which would qualify such employer for tax credits pursuant to the provisions of section 44B of such Code. Any such certification shall be withdrawn, and the employer so notified, upon receipt by the prime sponsor of notice under subsection (b) that such individual has failed to continue to be enrolled in and to regularly attend the classes conducted by a public or private elementary or secondary school.

"(b) Each prime sponsor shall enter into arrangements with public and private elementary and secondary schools in the area served by that prime sponsor (or with the local educational agencies administering such schools) under which the prime sponsor will be notified of the failure of any youth who has been certified under subsection (a) to continue to be enrolled in and to regularly attend the classes conducted by such school."

(2) The table of contents of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act is amended by inserting immediately after the item pertaining to section 112 the following new item:

"Sec. 113. Certification of in-school youth."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective October 1, 1979.



H.R. —

A bill to establish a program of full employment, vocational training, and employment placement for all young Americans willing and able to work, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the "Youth Employment Act of 1979".

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

- (1) the national rate of unemployment among youths is excessively high;
- (2) the number of youths who have ceased to seek employment because of insufficient job opportunities is unprecedented; and
- (3) employment problems faced by youth have not been adequately addressed by the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall establish a program to (1) provide financial assistance to States, political subdivisions of the States, and private for profit or nonprofit organizations established under section 109 of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, through the Youth Job Guarantee Office established under section 4 of this Act, in each labor market area of the country, for programs of training and employment in jobs on public service and private employment projects, for eligible individuals, and (2) provide special assistance to those eligible individuals who apply for such assistance, in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(b) There is hereby established in the Department of Labor a National Youth Full Employment Board, to be composed of members appointed by the Secretary who shall include a majority of representatives from labor, civil rights, youth, and women's organizations, chosen from among nominees submitted by these organizations, which shall advise the Secretary with respect to the program under subsection (a).

(c) In carrying out the program under subsection (a) in any labor market area, the Secretary shall consult with the Board, and with the prime sponsor's planning councils established under section 109 of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act which are located in that labor market area.

(d) (1) The Secretary, in carrying out his functions under this Act shall seek to reduce differentials in employment rates among various population segments.

(2) The Secretary shall carry out his functions under this Act in such a way that, within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, the rate of unemployment among youths aged sixteen to twenty-four, inclusive, in any political subdivision of any State shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total labor force in such subdivision within two years of the date of enactment of this Act, the rate of unemployment among youths aged sixteen to twenty-four, inclusive, in any political subdivision of any State shall not exceed 3 per centum of the total labor force in such subdivision and within three years of the date of enactment of this Act, jobs should be supplied for all youths aged sixteen to twenty-four, inclusive, within a reasonable period.

SEC. 4. There is hereby established in the Department of Labor a Youth Job Guarantee Office, to be headed by a Director to be appointed by the Board, through which the Secretary shall carry out the program under section 3(a), in order to insure that any eligible individual who applies for assistance under this Act shall be placed in useful and rewarding employment in a job on a project assisted under this Act or in other private or public employment. The Secretary shall establish a local office of the Youth Job Guarantee Office in each State.

SEC. 5. (a) In carrying out the program under section 3(a) through the Youth Job

Guarantee Office, the Secretary shall, under regulations established by the Secretary—

(1) insure that among projects planned adequate consideration is given to such individuals and groups as may face special obstacles (as defined in section 11(6) of this Act) in finding and holding useful and rewarding employment and shall provide or have provided through the coordination of existing programs special assistance, including counseling, training, and, where necessary, transportation and migration assistance;

(2) enter into agreements with any agency or organization described in section 3(a) for public services and private employment projects to be administered by such agency or organization, and such agreements shall provide for assurances that (A) an annual independent audit of the project will be submitted to the Secretary, through the Youth Job Guarantee Office, (B) books and records of such agency or organization relating to the project shall be available for reasonable review by the Secretary through such Office, (C) no eligible individual employed or applying for employment on the project shall be discriminated against because of that individual's sex, race, color, religion, national origin, political affiliation, or belief, (D) applicable provisions of chapter 15 (relating to political activity of certain State and local employees) of title 5, United States Code, will be met, (E) an annual report describing and evaluating in detail the project will be submitted to the Secretary through such Office, and (F) the provisions of section 6 will be complied with;

(3) in the case of any application from any State or any political subdivision of a State to enter into an agreement under paragraph (2), require that the application contain—

(A) assurances that such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will be adopted as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, funds received under this Act,

(B) assurances that any woman employee on such a project shall be entitled to a maternity benefit of not less than six months' leave without loss of pay or other employment benefits, and

(C) such other information as the Secretary deems necessary,

and approve any such application which meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (C);

(4) refer any eligible individual who applies in person for assistance under this Act, as appropriate (A) to private and public employment placement facilities, (B) for placement in jobs on public service and private employment projects conducted under any other Act and assisted under section 23 of this Act, or (C) in the event that, after attempting placement under clauses (A) and (B) for a period of five days after the date of the individual's application for assistance, there is not a high probability that successful placement for the individual will occur, then placement will be made in a program under section 3; and

(5) in cases where the Secretary, through the Youth Job Guarantee Office, determines on the basis of evidence obtained with respect to any otherwise eligible individual, that the individual is not in fact able or willing to work (and no such determination shall be based upon an individual's failure to work under any circumstances where such failure results from an unlawful employment practice prohibited by section 703 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964), declare that individual to be ineligible for assistance under this Act, and provide for appropriate administrative appeal procedures to review such determination if any appeal is sought within thirty days thereafter, which shall include procedures for the enrollment of that individual in the Job Corps, as provided in paragraph (3)(B), while such appeal or

any judicial review of such determination is pending.

(b) (1) Any agreement entered into under subsection (a) (2) shall provide for reimbursement by the Secretary of the additional cost to the agency or organization described in section 3(a) of the public service or private employment project administered by such agency or organization.

(2) Any individual referred to a program under this Act shall be deemed to meet the eligibility requirements for such program.

SEC. 6. (a) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in any construction, alteration, or repair (including painting and decorating) on projects which are assisted under this Act, shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. 276—276a-5), or those of trade union standards, whichever is higher. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to such labor standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267) and section 2 of the Act of June 1, 1934 (40 U.S.C. 276(c); 48 Stat. 948).

(b) The Secretary, through the Youth Job Guarantee Office, shall not enter into an agreement under section 5 unless the Secretary, through such Office, determines that—

(1) prevailing or trade union standards, whichever is higher, for the health, safety, and other conditions applicable to the performance of work and training on the project to be assisted are established and will be maintained;

(2) appropriate workmen's compensation protection will be provided for employees on this project;

(3) the project will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

(4) no employee shall be paid less than the prevailing or union wage, whichever is higher, in effect in the area; and

(5) all employees shall receive compensation (A) that bears a positive relationship to their qualifications, experience, and training, and (B) that will effectively encourage them (from an economic standpoint) to advance to other employment.

SEC. 7. No person shall, on the ground of race, color, religion, age, sex, national origin, political affiliation or belief, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving financial assistance under this Act.

SEC. 8. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over any action brought seeking relief, including injunctive, declaratory, and other appropriate forms of relief as well as damages, by any person or by any class of persons deprived of rights created by or under this Act, which rights shall include, but not be limited to the right to useful paid employment at the rate of compensation provided by this Act, and any person or class of persons who has been so deprived by the United States shall be entitled in an action brought against the United States to recover damages, together with costs and reasonable attorney's fees.

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1983, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 10. Section 109 of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) In addition to its functions and responsibilities under subsection (a), each planning council shall—

"(1) identify local needs for additional youth employment opportunities, and, under

guidelines established by the Secretary under the provisions of the Youth Employment Act of 1979, shall select and plan projects for assistance under such Act which shall provide public service and private employment (as such term is defined in section 11(2) of such Act) for young Americans; and

"(2) under standards, criteria, and guidelines established by the Secretary under the Youth Employment Act of 1979, monitor and evaluate projects assisted under such Act."

**Sec. 11. For purposes of this Act—**

(1) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor;

(2) the term "public service and private employment", when used with respect to a project, means any project providing new or expanded goods or services to the public, which reflects the needs and desires of the local community served by the project, and may include any project providing social services, community health services, day care facilities, legal aid, public transportation, housing, recreation, cultural activities, sanitation, environmental improvement;

(3) the term "Board" means the National Youth Full Employment Board established under section 3(b);

(4) the term "eligible individual" means any individual aged sixteen to twenty-four, inclusive, who is able and willing to work but who is not employed and who is unable to obtain employment other than by assistance under this Act;

(5) the term "able and willing to work", when used with respect to an individual, means any individual who, by application in person at a Youth Job Guarantee Office established under section 4, or at any regional office thereof, seeks assistance under this Act in obtaining a job, regardless of any visual, motor, or hearing impairment, mental retardation, or other handicap;

(6) the term "special obstacle", when used with respect to an eligible individual's efforts to find or hold useful and rewarding employment, includes past or present discrimination or bias on the basis of sex, color, religion, or national origin, physical or mental handicap, past or present receipt of public assistance, residence in a depressed urban or rural geographical area, past or present status as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, unemployment resulting from relocation, closing, or reduced operations of industrial or military facilities, and such other special obstacles as the President or the Congress may from time to time designate for such purpose;

(7) the term "political subdivision" means any city, county, town, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State; and

(8) the term "State" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.●

**PROMISE OF PEACE IN RHODESIA  
DELAYED**

**HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, as cochairman of the MCPL Rhodesia Task Force, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article describing the current perceptions of Rhodesians in regard to the Muzorewa government. This article presents a new viewpoint which was not

heard in the Senate debate on the Rhodesian sanctions issue.

The June 18, 1979, Washington Star article reprinted below, "Rhodesia's New Black Rulers in Trouble on Peace Pledge," describes the diminishing support for the new Zimbabwe-Rhodesia Government, as the promise of peace continues to elude that country.

Blacks, especially those in the rural areas, are impatient for the war to end. For the new Government to win the war it must have the help of the rural Africans, and, at the same time, it must convince them that the new authorities in Salisbury are capable of causing defections in the ranks of the Patriotic Front guerrillas.

In Zimbabwe-Rhodesia today neither blacks nor whites will long support a government which seems incapable of ending the present war. For its part, the United States should not be in any hurry to lift sanctions against a government which does not have the support or loyalty of its people.

I commend the following article to your attention:

**RHODESIA'S NEW BLACK RULERS IN TROUBLE  
ON PEACE PLEDGE**

(By Lawrence E. Pintak)

**SALISBURY, ZIMBABWE-RHODESIA.**—Prime Minister Abel Muzorewa's new government faces real danger that it could lose its base of support if it does not soon deliver the peace that was promised before the election that put it in power.

Many blacks, particularly those in the rural areas, are growing impatient waiting for an end to their suffering. Many are wondering why the fighting is continuing and why the guerrillas are not laying down their weapons as Muzorewa predicted.

Black civilians, innocents and those labeled by the government as "terrorist collaborators" continue to die at the rate of 15 to 20 a day, according to government figures. Africans returning from tribal areas tell of the deaths of large numbers of relatives, killed not only by the guerrillas but also by security forces.

"I was a Muzorewa supporter, but now I am wondering why the war is not ending," said one black in Salisbury's Harare township. "He promised to bring peace."

In order to win the war, Muzorewa must have the backing of rural Africans. Without intelligence they provide, security forces have little chance of effectively routing out the guerrillas.

However, unless the government can provide evidence that it is winning the battle in the bush, the mass of Africans might easily shift their support back to the guerrillas.

"There is going to be tremendous disillusionment among the blacks," predicts Ahern Pally, a former white member of Parliament. "They thought the election itself would be an end to the war."

"When the blacks learn the bishop cannot end the war, they will turn to the externals (guerrillas), who they think can," Pally says.

Most blacks were voting for peace, and Muzorewa—with his cultivated image as the "man of peace"—appeared the person best able to bring it about.

But African societies, like most others, traditionally support the strong man, and if they perceive it is the guerrillas and not Muzorewa's forces that pose the greatest threat to them—and, conversely, can best protect them—they will not hesitate to realign their loyalties.

"I can't tell you how long it is going to take us to convince the people that we have

changed the situation," Muzorewa said in an interview, "but I can assure you we can expect a very different (security) situation in several weeks. How long they (the people) will be patient, is a matter of anybody's calculation."

Many persons believe, however, that if the bishop does not quickly take firm action, he will fall.

"He has no time," says black businessman Ephraim Chamba. "The people say, 'There's independence, do something.' They know things have changed in other African countries when independence was achieved and they want the same thing to happen here."

There also is evidence that Muzorewa's intention to continue raids against guerrilla bases in neighboring countries also may eat into his support.

"The people were crying when they heard he had attacked into Mozambique, even those who did not have sons there," said a Salisbury house servant.

"They want to know why he is killing them if he promised peace. He said there would be no more war, then out he just goes and kills them."

Other blacks are disillusioned with the continued presence of whites in important positions in the new government.

"People are getting surprised at how Mr. Walls (Lt. Gen. Peter Walls, chief of the country's security forces) is still on instead of Muzorewa putting in his own person," said one, who insisted that Muzorewa's decision to appoint himself minister of defense did not change the fact that whites were still running the army.

White confidence, too, could be an important factor in whether Muzorewa's government survives. Whites continue to leave the country in large numbers—1,628 "took the gap," as leaving is called, in April—and many of those who remain are simply growing tired of fighting.

"This is my country, and I'm going to fight for it," said one young "troopie." "But if the war is still going on in December like it is now, I'm 'gapping' it."

And without experienced white officers to run his army, Muzorewa's chances of ending the war—and retaining the support of the black masses—would be reduced to almost nil.●

**CALIFORNIA AND THE GAS  
SHORTAGE**

**HON. GEORGE MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, nine of my colleagues and I have recently introduced the Emergency Gasoline and Diesel Fuel Conservation Act of 1979, H.R. 4283, to fill a void left by the defeat of the President's standby gas rationing plan. We believe that it is a responsible alternative that will cut gas consumption, leave room for maximum individual freedom, and prevent the creation of another Federal bureaucracy.

We in California have experienced shortages, and have had to cope with long lines and short tempers at the gas pumps. But we have coped. Gasoline consumption has dropped dramatically, mass transit ridership is way up, and the initial panic has subsided. As we continue to examine the reasons behind the shortage, I think it would be wise to remember that California is not



much different than the rest of the Nation in our gas consumption. A recent article by Richard Reeves, Esquire's national editor, discusses the reasons behind the shortage and California's situation in a highly informative and enlightening way. I commend the material in the piece to all of my colleagues.

[From Esquire Magazine, June 19, 1979]

(By Richard Reeves)

#### ARE CALIFORNIANS CRAZY?

On May 18, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, the senator from New York, traveled to Buffalo, in the far reaches of his representative domain to explain the ways of the world to anyone who would listen. Nine reporters showed up at a news conference, sitting politely as Moynihan spoke, as one does to children, of many things. He spoke of SALT and the Russians, of looniness and the Californians.

"Yes, there is a gasoline shortage," he said. "And New Yorkers have been acting intelligently and capably. But there's something about the state of California. They're a funny bunch. They've panicked. It's the equivalent of a run on the bank."

"I was talking to Secretary Schlesinger at a reception yesterday; he told me the average sale of gasoline in California has gone down from eight gallons to three gallons. People are just topping off their almost full tanks."

Recalling some of James Schlesinger's earlier mathematics—body counts in Vietnam—I offered Moynihan the hyperbolic opinion that Secretary of Energy Schlesinger was either a fool or a liar. "Does he really think," I said, "that people out there are waiting on line for two and a half hours to put three gallons in their tanks?"

The stupidity of politicians in the coming oil crisis is matched only by their cowardice. It's bad enough that people like Moynihan and Schlesinger and many of their peer group don't know what they're talking about. They also seem to feel compelled to make sure that the country will be torn apart by resentment and manipulations over who gets the perfumes of Araby.

So Senator Charles Percy of Illinois says that as far as he's concerned, frenzied Californians are creating their own problems, and Congressman Carlos Moorhead of Los Angeles says he doesn't give a damn about heating oil for the Northeast but he wants gas for his Angelinos.

I do care, very much, about heating oil, and production of it obviously has to be the country's first priority; there is a difference between Californians swearing at one another in two-mile lines and little old ladies freezing to death next February in Vermont. But having waited in some of those lines before Moynihan informed me of what was really going on, I had the distinct impression that, all things considered, Californians were behaving very well—indeed, capably.

It's true that a guy named Diton Williams pulled a gun at a service station in West Hollywood and held off a crowd while he filled his tank. And that Johnny Rodgers, a wide receiver for the San Diego Chargers football team, got so annoyed waiting in line to fill up his Rolls-Royce that he bought the gas station. But it's also true that all the people I saw after the shortage hit La La Land last month were pumping \$10 worth and more into empty tanks. And that Fred Hartley, president of Union Oil, says that the average sale at Union stations is between thirteen and fourteen gallons.

Los Angeles, in fact, looks a bit like a ghost town on weekends. People simply aren't going anywhere unless they have to. That's part of the reason President Carter only saw 2,000 people at the city's Cinco de Mayo festival on May 5 instead of the usual crowd of 5,000 or so. On weekdays, traffic seems to

be down from 50 to 75 percent of what it was in April.

In April, before this began, California had about 10 percent of the nation's population, 10 percent of the nation's drivers, and 10 percent of the nation's automobiles—and was using 9.5 percent of the nation's gasoline. The average monthly gas consumption per California vehicle was 59.7 gallons, compared with 73 gallons in Virginia and Georgia and a national average of 64 gallons. Californians may wash and love their cars more than the rest of us do, but most of them are not guzzling gas. One reason is that the ownership of small cars is much higher in California than anywhere else in the United States.

There was, undoubtedly, some panic on May 3 and a couple of days after. Gas stations were suddenly closed (or open for only two or three hours a day), and there was, in Schlesinger's pet phrase, "topping off." We'll all be panicked the first time we drive thirty miles or so and see the "Closed" or "No Gas" signs on every pump along the way. That's all there was to it, Washington said, claiming that the California gasoline shortfall was only 3 or 5 percent.

That was not true. The real shortfall was apparently close to 15 percent of 1978 allocations. There were, as it turned out, very real reasons that there was less gas around the freeways. "Panic" was a minor factor. The main reasons, as ferreted out by California newspapers, particularly the Los Angeles Times, were these:

Production cutbacks of crude oil in Iran and Saudi Arabia.

Inadequate West Coast refinery capacity, especially of facilities handling heavy crude from places like Alaska, caused partly by California's protectionist environmental laws and partly by the oil companies' anticipation of reduced gasoline usage in the future. No refinery has been built in California for seven years.

The switch to early heating oil production for next winter, intelligently encouraged by President Carter.

Allocations based on past usage, which discriminated against areas with growing population.

A spectacularly ill-timed new distribution system that on May 1 ended gas deliveries to stations on demand and substituted regularly scheduled deliveries, which rarely came off as scheduled.

"Hoarding" by business and industry. Between January and April, companies like Hertz Rent-A-Car and Pacific Telephone & Telegraph, anticipating shortages, increased their gas orders by 74 percent over last year.

Increases in "priority" gasoline deliveries to agricultural areas, military installations, hospitals, fire departments, and police stations. Every gallon that goes to those places—and by law, they get every gallon they ask for—is a gallon less at gas stations.

So there was and is a real California shortage. Californians may be crazy, but they're not as dumb or as irresponsible as some of the folks attacking them, from Jimmy Carter and Schlesinger and *The Washington Post*—"a good thing," the *Post* editorialized, to curb California's "hedonistic life-style"—down to Mike Royko of the *Chicago Sun-Times*, who was at least very funny when he wrote:

"A column that I wrote, expressing the sensible view that Gov. Brown is a political moonbeam, and that California is the world's largest outdoor mental asylum, appeared in five California newspapers. Since then, thousands of Californians have been taking time out from munching their granola and riding their surf-boards to write me shrill letters. . . . So think of that, the next time you write me about the superiority of your lifestyle. Think of being damned to a lifetime of sitting and staring at your backyard pool, wondering if—Good Lord—

does the pool-maintenance man have enough gas to get to you?"

Déjà vu. I keep waiting for the New York *Daily News* headline: "Carter to California: Drop Dead." (The *Los Angeles Herald Examiner* has already used "Carter to LA: Take a Walk.") The treatment and the rhetoric are a replay of the New York City fiscal crisis in 1975: Greedy, self-indulgent libertines deserve what they get. Why should we help them?

Because them is us. It has become worse than a cliché to say that there is no leadership in Washington. But things are worse when the substitute for some kind of national unity during a national crisis is an unthinking policy of divide and scapegoat. New York did foul up and was self-indulgent for years, but that was not the city's real problem, which was that it was old and that in many ways it had outlived its usefulness to the new places, to the West. So, a lot of those westerners thought, let the Big Apple rot in its own juices—Jerry Brown said it was decadent. God knows, California is self-indulgent—God and the California Coastal Commission forbid that oil wells should interfere with any Pacific views!—but its gasoline problems this spring had nothing to do with mellow wackiness. The "mellow" probably prevented big trouble. Gas shortages may be like blackouts: The first one is an adventure; the looting begins with the second one; then come the riots.

Politics, after all, is about dividing up the resources of a society. The President and Congress can take the risks of doing that or they can let states, cities, and individuals fight it out themselves. California could, for instance, try to cut a separate oil deal with Mexico—it might not work, but it would make people such as Pat Moynihan prophets. They could be prophets of sunny funniness and prophets in their own country, which at the moment they define as not including California.

The fact that Americans believe they are being screwed by Arabs and oil companies does not mean that they are not capable enough or intelligent enough to know that there is a real and long-range energy problem. Americans who happen to live in California dealt with the new reality; they seem less the problem than doctors Moynihan and Schlesinger do. ●

#### LIVES OF THOUSANDS OF REFUGEES ARE IN PERIL

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the National Coalition for Refugee Resettlement meeting on Capitol Hill expressed strong support for the need for a concerted effort to meet the needs of thousands of refugees who are fleeing from war and persecution but can find no refuge in Southeast Asia.

The coalition, composed of more than 130 members representing National, State, and local public and voluntary agencies which plan for and administer programs serving refugees, strongly endorsed the passage of new comprehensive refugee legislation introduced by Congressman RODINO and Congresswoman HOLTZMAN and Senator KENNEDY (H.R. 2816, S. 643).

Mr. Speaker, as the situation continues to worsen for the men, women, and children of Indochina who have fled in

leaky boats or across dangerous terrain only to be turned back on the beaches of Malaysia or at the Thai border, it was good to hear many eloquent voices raised on behalf of these suffering people and in support of the need for us to do all that we can to prevent further needless deaths.

I request that the remarks of Bishop Thomas Kelly, the General Secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, and an active participant in the humanitarian efforts to assist these refugees, be inserted in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF THE MOST REVEREND THOMAS C. KELLY

I am grateful for the opportunity to be with you this afternoon. I strongly endorse the efforts you are making to sensitize our nation to the desperate needs of the ever-growing, worldwide body of refugees.

The fact that Senator Kennedy, Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, has introduced legislation to amend and introduce additional humanitarian concerns into our refugee legislation is a source of encouragement to the National Conference of Catholic Bishops.

This meeting is being held at a time when we are all acutely aware of the potential for a vast tragedy. Not only the well-being but the very lives of thousands of refugees are in peril at this very moment. Many have already died. Tens of thousands of others are crowded into dismal refugee camps or huddled in the holds of rotting junks. There is need for an immediate response by the international community if lives are to be saved.

Our nation has done much in the past. But the time is at hand for us to exhibit in a dramatic and practical manner our desire to exercise moral leadership in this unsettled world.

Of the tens of thousands of desperate refugees, many are the children, brothers or sisters of those already in the United States. They are categorically eligible for admission to this country. I have, therefore, requested in a telegram to the President that those who will eventually come to our shores be immediately moved to a safe haven—either to one of our military bases overseas, such as Subic Bay, Clark Field, or possibly Guam. This action would certainly indicate to the countries of first asylum that there are answers to this problem other than shooting or drowning.

As far as actual resettlement in the United States is concerned, the Catholic bishops of the United States join with you in assuring our Government that resettlement opportunities will be provided for any and all refugees admitted. When people are drowning at sea, as tens of thousands of men, women and children already have, we cannot let diplomatic technicalities or heartless programming dominate. This is the moment for us to do what is right, moral, and necessary. ●

#### UNDERMINING AMERICA'S ENERGY FUTURE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Protection Agency has disclosed that it will issue regulations allowing the use of high-sulfur coal in the powerplants of Ohio and will not require the installation of expensive

scrubbers at some of these plants. This is a small victory for commonsense that has been a long time in coming. In 1977 the EPA forced eight Ohio utilities to meet Federal sulfur dioxide emission standards. The utilities responded by buying low-sulfur coal from the Western States instead of the high-sulfur coal from Ohio. This led to higher energy costs for Ohio utility consumers and to the loss of jobs in Ohio coal mines. This was clearly a case of environmental concerns versus energy and job needs.

But the twist here was that the environmentalists were also against western coal because of the impact of strip-mining on the western lands. Instead of leaving well enough alone a number of coal-State Senators, including the junior Senator from Ohio, stepped in with legislation to force coal users to buy "regionally available" coal. The amendment passed but the term "regionally available" became a court battle over congressional intent. When the courts ruled this matter a political question the ball was back in the EPA's court, where it all began. With the new regulations normalcy should return to Ohio, and consumers will avoid massive increases in their utility bills, but the scars remain.

I am always amazed at the mentality that is rampant in Washington when it comes to conflicts between two major groups. In the case of coal, the energy versus environment issue should have been faced head on. There are trade-offs that are inevitable when two major concerns come into conflict. Any ultimate solution to such a conflict must include the weighing of the trade-offs and the making of a decision based on some general commitment to a direction you want policy to head. The Ohio coal situation was handled in usual Washington style. The main issue was not addressed. Instead new legislation was passed to further control private industry, the victim, not the cause, of the whole problem. Even this buck passing attempt failed because of vague language in the bill, another curse of Washington. It took the courts to set matters right, and some commonsense on the part of EPA to settle the issue. In the process jobs and lives were put into limbo and large amounts of money was spent on lawyers. This is all in addition to the 3 years that were lost for the development of energy in Ohio. This is no way to run a Government, this is no way to represent a State, and this is certainly no way to build for future energy needs.

I call my colleagues' attention to a recent Wall Street Journal editorial that shares my outrage on this matter. I just hope in the future that steadier hands are at the helm of our energy policy, for Ohio's sake and for America's.

The article follows:

#### UNDERMINING COAL

As followers of the twists and turns of federal energy policy will know, our government means for coal to be the fuel of the future, with utilities and industry converting out of oil and gas and into this plentiful resource.

The President's 1977 National Energy Plan called for U.S. coal production to climb some 80% over the next 12 years. To speed the switchover, Congress last year passed the Coal

Conversion Act, requiring use of coal in industry where the change could be made without undue hardship.

So it may come as a surprise to hear that Consolidation Coal Co., a Conoco subsidiary, has just closed one mine in Ohio and reduced the workforce at another. Or perhaps as a greater surprise to learn that U.S. coal production has hardly budged since 1977. Or that the coal industry has excess capacity of over 100 million tons a year.

The key reason is that coal, like nuclear energy, is badly tangled in the web of environmental policy. The Ohio cutbacks give some clue as to how tangled the web has become.

In 1977, the federal Environmental Protection Agency, frustrated by Ohio's delay in instituting pollution controls, took the matter into its own hands and ordered eight Ohio utilities to meet federal sulfur dioxide emission standards. The utilities responded by buying less Ohio coal, which contains a high level of sulfur and requires expensive "scrubbing," and by purchasing more out-of-state, low-sulfur coal.

But this threat to the jobs of Ohio miners was brought to the attention of Ohio Senator Howard M. Metzenbaum, whose interest in energy up to that point was mainly limited to his efforts to discourage domestic oil and gas production. He and three other coal-state Senators succeeded in writing some hoped-for protection into the Clean Air Act. They were joined, interestingly enough, by environmentalists intent on discouraging Western strip mining of low-sulfur coal.

The legislation grants the EPA authority to order major coal users, such as utilities, to buy "regionally available" coal and, if necessary, to install antipollution equipment as long as it can be shown that the use of coal from outside the region would contribute to significant economic disruption or unemployment in nearby coal fields. Except there was no very clear definition of "regionally available."

Ohio miners take "region" to mean within the state's borders, but miners in neighboring Kentucky and West Virginia, where supplies of low-sulfur coal can be found, disagree. A federal court in Kentucky earlier this month upheld the constitutionality of the restriction but it didn't attempt to define what "regionally available" means. The court suggested that the plaintiffs "address themselves to the political process" for a remedy.

That leaves the ball back in the EPA's court, but the agency says it doesn't know when a decision will be reached. Its preliminary investigation found "economic disruption" in the area and, if finalized, would require Ohio utilities to burn indigenous high-sulfur coal and to install scrubbers.

Utilities in Ohio, which happens to be the nation's largest coal consuming state, estimate that the cost of buying and operating scrubbers will be \$1 billion annually for years to come, a bill that would be footed by Ohio's electricity consumers. Such a decision by the EPA would also reduce the incentive to develop low-sulfur coal reserves in the West.

As it happens, the administration is scheduled to make a decision this month on a national sulfur dioxide emissions policy for large, stationary, fossil-fueled, utility steam generating units. This decision, as with the Metzenbaum amendment, will be tangled in regional and environmental politics. Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd is putting heavy pressure on the President to set a standard that would permit continued use of high-sulfur coal. Environmentalists are threatening to sue the EPA if the administration opts for the kind of weak standard Senator Byrd would like.

Meanwhile, the administration's coal conversion policy is a beached whale. No one is in a hurry to convert out of oil until they find out what the rules will be or where the



coal will come from. Some users of heavy fuel oil, also subject to sulfur standards, are cutting it with middle distillates, contributing to the shortage of home heating oil, diesel fuel and gasoline. The utilities are warning that unless someone exercises some leadership, people will be lining up for electricity, as well as gasoline, in the 1980s. Coal faces a clouded future indeed.●

#### THE POPE'S DIVISIONS

### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the visit of Pope John Paul II to his native Poland ranks among the most historic and influential journeys of our time. In effect, the Pope gave a ringing and irrefutable answer to the cynical question once asked by Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin: "How many divisions does the Pope have?" The Pope's reception in Poland and the words he spoke there must have convinced Stalin's heirs that while the Pope does not command any armed divisions, he does command the spiritual allegiance of those denied full religious liberty in his native land. It is a loving, natural allegiance which makes a mockery out of any claim of the present rulers of Poland to legitimacy.

The historical importance of the Pope's visit is so obvious that I need not dwell on it here. Suffice it to say that I know of no parallel to it, either in modern or ancient times.

The Polish people whose bravery is as well known as their allegiance to the Roman Catholic faith have been dominated first by Nazi and then by Communist tyrants for over 40 years. Yet under such terrible conditions the Polish people were able to produce a man like the present Pope. It is certainly a tribute to the spirit of the people of Poland that not only was the return of the native son made a living symbol of the bond of faith that holds together the Polish people against all oppressors but that they somehow struck a delicate balance between fervent national and religious pride on one hand and an avoidance of violent incidents on the other.

The influential aspect of the Pope's visit may be a bit more difficult to determine, for we are only now able to calmly examine its political and philosophical importance. I believe a few points can be made even at this early stage. It seems quite clear that while we cannot extend the lesson of Poland and the Pope to other nations—after all, both the present Pope and his native land are unique products of a unique historical experience—it seems clear that religious faith in Eastern Europe has endured and survived the efforts of Communist dictators to crush it.

This is, I believe, one of the most important political as well as religious facts of our time. Who among us would have predicted 25 years ago that the "church of silence" behind the Iron Curtain would be so strong and so vital today? Needless to say it is not simply the Ro-

man Catholic faith that has survived, but many others, as witness the recent release of Baptist and Jewish dissidents by the Soviet Union. The Pope's visit served as a focal point for this phenomenon and the media, at long last, devoted attention to it.

But I think the most influential aspect of the visit will be on the Western World, particularly our own Nation. We in the West have unwittingly fallen into the same frame of mind that allowed Stalin to ask his infamous question. We discuss only our material gains and our armed might when we assess our political strength against that of Communist-dominated lands. But despite the myth that "modern man" has turned away from religion (a myth perpetrated by those intellectual and media circles who too often confuse their private and limited experience with the way things are all over the world), it is clear that decades of totalitarian dominance may have smothered but cannot kill the religious convictions of millions.

The West needs to remember that and profit by it. We are engaged in something more than a battle of weapons. We are engaged in a battle of ideas, convictions, beliefs. If we neglect or take for granted the rich religious heritage that is ours we will come to the international arena so much the poorer. In reminding us of this simple but essential fact the Pope has done the West as well as his native land a great service.●

#### ANOTHER PANAMA VOTE

### HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the Washington Star of today:

[From the Washington Star, June 19, 1979]

#### ANOTHER PANAMA VOTE

No one is complacent about the House action scheduled tomorrow on legislation to carry out the Panama Canal treaties. The voting is expected to be close, and the possibility of harmful amendments is too great for comfort. The legislators should keep in mind that an irresponsible course in the matter, though momentarily appealing to diehard jingoist sentiment, could have serious economic and diplomatic consequences for the nation.

The implementing legislation now pending should not be controversial. The basic questions of the Canal's future, after all, were settled with the Senate's ratification of the treaties last year. Under those agreements, Panama will assume control of the waterway by the year 2000, and will begin taking over major portions of the Canal Zone this October 1. The pros and cons of this process were exhaustively reviewed during years of negotiation and the months it took the Senate to consider and ratify the documents.

Some of the present trouble in the House is due to that chamber's exclusion from the ratification process. Congressmen who wanted a piece of the action—especially to vote it down—resented the fact that they were ignored. They are trying now to make some-

one pay for the slight. Their main grievance in this regard, however, should be addressed to the Framers of the Constitution and not the Panamanians, the administration or the advising and consenting U.S. Senate.

With major provisions of the treaties to take effect in little more than three months, legislation to perform the United States' part of the bargain requires approval of both houses of Congress. It is necessary, for instance, to create a temporary commission to run the Canal and set tolls until Panama takes over at the end of the century. The administration already has lost a battle in a House committee over a version that makes the commission more like a government agency answerable to Congress for yearly appropriations than the relatively independent government corporation envisioned by the White House.

As the measure is taken up on the House floor, efforts will be made by anti-treaty forces to alter the terms substantially. An amendment by Rep. George Hansen aims at requiring Panama to pay all costs of carrying out the treaties. This and other proposed changes, if enacted, could result in Panama accusing the United States of reneging on its treaty obligations.

Both Panama and the administration have been guilty of providing ammunition for treaty critics in the House. Panamanian officials have created grounds for diversionary attacks with their support of anti-Somoza forces in Nicaragua—the anti-treaty camp pictures the Canal under a government that foments leftist revolution in the Hemisphere. The Carter administration has been uncommunicative about costs related to the gradual turnover of the Canal, spurring efforts to take these hundreds of millions (or billions, depending on who's doing the estimating) out of the Panamanians' expected income.

Whatever the House does, it will have to be reconciled eventually with the wishes of the other chamber. The senators are expected to pass implementing legislation in line with the spirit and letter of the treaties they ratified. The test of the final congressional product will be how it affects the prospect for proper operation of the Canal over the next two decades.

A result that amounts to breaking the treaties (or is seen by our treaty partners as doing so) could raise questions about the status of the Canal after October 1. Aside from legalities, if Panamanian opinion is outraged, the physical security of the Canal could be endangered.

The nation's economic stake in the peaceful operation of the waterway remains substantial. It even bears on the current gasoline shortage because Alaskan oil is carried through the Canal on its way to refineries in the Gulf of Mexico. The American people will not feel kindly toward the congressman who damages the nation's interests at such a conspicuously vulnerable point.●

#### SALT II

### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, our Nation took a meaningful step toward national security and world peace this weekend. As an American and as a Member of Congress, I take special pride in knowing that our President confronted the arduous task of limiting the nuclear arms race and produced positive results.

However, not just the United States, but the entire world will benefit from President Carter's leadership and determination.

The escalation of nuclear arms seems to be an almost natural process for post-industrial and developing nations. To openly try to halt this terribly dangerous aspect of modern society requires wisdom and courage. President Carter has shown both of these qualities.

When the President addressed the Congress and the American people in this Chamber last evening, he said:

The truth of the nuclear age is that the United States and the Soviet Union must live in peace—or we may not live at all.

The second strategic arms limitation treaty is based on this assumption—that peace must be derived from a strong United States defense and a general reduction of the arms race among nations. I am very encouraged that this treaty will contribute to greater stability and long term peace in the world.

The treaty also means that our Nation will not be forced to put billions of dollars into the senseless production of weapons. Instead of using our valuable capital, resources, and manpower for destructive purposes, we will be able to use them for improving the quality of life for all of our citizens—especially the poor, the elderly, and the disadvantaged.

The President recognizes that the fight against the arms race never will be completely won. Already, he is working on SALT III. But his tremendous efforts in skillful negotiation deserve our admiration and gratitude—and this treaty deserves our support.

Our Senate must now engage in public debate, then vote to ratify the treaty according to our Constitution. This process makes the treaty not merely a pact among leaders but a commitment of the American people. It will be the word of a nation which speaks through an open and democratic government.

This treaty deserves nothing less, for at issue is the choice between survival and annihilation. I am confident that the American people will support SALT II, and I am hopeful that the other House will move in this direction.●

#### FREEDOM HOUSE CALLS FOR CONSTRUCTIVE MIDDLE COURSE ON ZIMBABWE-RHODESIA

**HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the House prepares to debate later this week a resolution calling for lifting economic sanctions against Zimbabwe-Rhodesia, the following statement issued by the board of trustees of Freedom House should be of special interest.

This statement, issued by Freedom House Chairman Clifford Case, former U.S. Senator and coauthor of the Case-Javits amendment of 1978, points out

the progress toward democracy now underway in Zimbabwe.

Acknowledging the flaws in both the Constitution and the April election, which was monitored by Freedom House observers, the statement urges that the United States steer a middle course in our relationship with the new Zimbabwe Government. It recommends that we give clear credit for the progress that has been made while continuing to press for additional reforms. Mr. Speaker, I commend the statement to my colleagues:

A CONSTRUCTIVE MIDDLE COURSE FOR THE UNITED STATES ON ZIMBABWE RHODESIA  
(By the Board of Trustees of Freedom House)  
I. NO CONSTRUCTIVE U.S. ACTION YET ON ZIMBABWE RHODESIA

We regret that President Carter's June 7 statement on Zimbabwe Rhodesia took insufficient note of a significant democratizing process which we believe is now under way in Zimbabwe. We hope he will move quickly to encourage further progress toward a more democratic, freer society in that country.

The President faulted Zimbabwe's April election and the constitution under which polling took place. Despite substantial flaws in both the constitution and the election, the Freedom House mission which observed the electoral process at first hand found it to be a significant advance toward multiracial and majority rule, freer and more inclusive than elections previously in Rhodesia, and freer than elections in most developing countries.

There have been other significant changes in Zimbabwe. Discriminatory laws have been repealed. A black Prime Minister has appointed his cabinet and other top national leaders. Blacks now comprise 85 percent of the security forces and 75 percent of the police force.

By failing to give adequate recognition to these significant movements toward a more democratic, multiracial society in Zimbabwe, the President has missed an opportunity to reinforce these movements. Instead, he has maintained a policy that was created for conditions that no longer exist. The tone of his statement—apart from the decision not to lift sanctions now—was unnecessarily discouraging to the elected black leadership of that country. We do not believe it is constructive to hold up to a developing country the standard of current political practice in the United States.

It is not sufficient to say that the President was bound by American law (the Case-Javits Amendment of 1978). The Congress passed Case-Javits in full knowledge of then existing flaws in the Rhodesian constitution, and the manner of its ratification, as well as the nature of the election to be held this April. Our Board chairman, Clifford P. Case, testified May 16 that the Case-Javits amendment was never intended to put the President or the U.S. government in a straitjacket over Rhodesia. Case-Javits said that in certain circumstances the President should lift sanctions. It did not say that in no other circumstances should sanctions be lifted.

Nor is Freedom House recommending that sanctions be lifted now. We reiterate that lifting sanctions too rapidly would bring as disastrous results for American policy as lifting sanctions too slowly. Present American policy, left unchanged by the President's June 7 statement, however, continues to apply U.S. pressure only against one side—the black elected government.

II. NEW U.S. ACTION NEEDED NOW

We support a middle course. We would employ sanctions as a lever on both the insurgents (Patriotic Front) and the elected

government. The U.S. should declare clearly and warmly—not grudgingly and halfheartedly—that Zimbabwe has effectively changed many conditions that originally led to our policy of nonrecognition and our support for international sanctions. We should state explicitly that we will look for continuing evidence that the ostensible transition is actually taking place.

The black parliament, for example, should lift censorship (except for insurgency matters), charge detainees under law and progressively release them (except for clear-cut insurgency acts), open more land to black ownership, improve black educational and medical standards, and increase the number of black officers in the security and police forces. Prime Minister Abel T. Muzorewa has already invited insurgent leaders to meet with him; he should repeat this offer and expand the agenda for discussion.

President Carter should not allow U.S. policy to be intimidated by the posture black African states assume in southern Africa where they apply economic sanctions in public, while trading with Rhodesia and South Africa in private. We believe that the responsible black African states would welcome moderate American actions—not merely rhetoric—designed to advance multiracial, majority rule in Zimbabwe.

Overwhelmingly, the victims of economic sanctions and the related bloody insurgency are the black Zimbabweans. While British policy toward Zimbabwe has recently softened, U.S. policy has remained rigid, leaving to America no role in promoting an all-party settlement that will end the death and turmoil in Zimbabwe Rhodesia.

President Carter has played the role of policeman in admonishing Zimbabwe. Now he should play the role of statesman, and work to heal the wounds of struggle. As Zimbabwe moves toward greater democratization and multiracial rule, therefore, the United States should initiate discussions with the black government looking toward the lifting of sanctions and ultimately the granting of recognition.

To offer the carrot after the stick, the President should immediately dispatch an official American observer to Salisbury, as the British government has already done. The American observer should be drawn from outside the U.S. government, and given authority to move freely about southern Africa and encourage all parties to negotiate.

The President, meanwhile, should send humanitarian aid to Zimbabwe to help rehabilitate victims of economic sanctions and the insurgency. He should also encourage the Zimbabweans to begin planning for U.S. aid to enable the new government to buy out the contracts of white civil servants, encouraging their early retirement, and making place for more black officials; train blacks in civil service entry jobs; and support training to prepare black police to become officers.

President Carter on June 7 displayed rhetorical strength for the benefit of the frontline states but at the expense of Zimbabweans. We hope that he will now display wisdom and moderation, through more creative diplomacy.●

#### OPEC AND OUR BANKS

**HON. GEORGE MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, with the rapidly increasing price of OPEC oil this year, we are again reminded of the plight of the less devel-



oped countries, who have to borrow tremendous amounts of money to pay their oil bills. A fascinating article in the New Republic earlier this year discusses the relationship between these loans, the OPEC nations, and our Nation's banks. I hope my colleagues will read this article carefully, for its implications are tremendous for our country's financial stability:

**THE BANKER'S DILEMMA**  
(By William J. Quirk)

When bankers begin talking of "holocaust scenarios," as they have been lately, it is time for the rest of us to pay attention. The problem seems to be that the American banks have loaned \$37.7 billion which will probably not be repaid. Default on this much money would bust the banks which in turn would bust the country which in turn would bust the world.

The \$37.7 billion is the amount of unguaranteed loans by American banks outstanding to poor countries that do not produce oil. It seems fairly unlikely that these loans will be repaid. The loans are not legally enforceable since the debtor is a sovereign state. No court has any jurisdiction over Zaire. Can an American bank, under its state law, take depositors' funds and make a loan that is not legally enforceable? It was a good question.

David Rockefeller is a famous world traveler. With his retinue he goes to foreign capitals where he is treated as a visiting head of state. The best silver is brought out and he is wine and dined as befits his station. He may be better than a head of state because he has money. Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank has loaned \$4.2 billion to the LDCs (for "less developed countries," which is the current euphemism). What do the LDCs want with all that money? That's simple; they want to pay their oil bills.

Since 1973 the Arabs have extorted \$133 billion from the oil consuming countries. About \$50 billion of that, according to Senator Church's subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, has been invested in stocks, bonds, land and businesses in the industrial West. Another \$50 billion is on short term deposit in big commercial banks, mostly in New York and London. About half of the Arabs' short-term deposits are in United States banks.

Twenty-five billion dollars is a lot of money, even to David Rockefeller. Huge deposits like that could tremendously increase bank earnings. Bankers traditionally have been conservative about the quality of their assets. But the large New York banks were caught up in the go-go spirit of the 1960s. They are now obsessed with showing a better earnings record than their competitors. This is a dangerous frame of mind for a banker.

So the Arabs dangled the \$25 billion and the New York banks grabbed for it. But there were two strings attached. First, the bank's solvency becomes subject to Arab whim. To make money on this \$25 billion, the banks have had to lend it out again. But the Arabs may pull out these short-term deposits at any time and thereby bust the banks, which cannot recall their loans so quickly—if at all. In the old West the big rancher controlled the local bank because he was the big depositor. In the same sense the Arabs now control the New York banks. These banks are captive to international extortionists. In any honest view the New York banks should now be viewed as Arab institutions. David Rockefeller, based as he is on oil, is now a mouthpiece for the oil sheikhs.

The second big string was that in order to get the Arab deposits, the banks had to agree to lend money to poor countries so they can purchase the oil they need. There was a clear advantage to the Arabs here since

the poor countries simply could not pay the quadrupled oil prices. In a reasonable world these nations would have refused to pay and the cartel would have been forced to lower its price. But the New York banks have lent money to the LDCs to finance oil that they cannot afford. And the Arabs lend the money to David Rockefeller to lend to the LDCs.

The Arabs could have extended credit themselves to finance poor countries' oil purchases. They chose the indirect approach for a good reason. If you give credit directly you have the LDC as a debtor. The Arabs preferred to have Chase Manhattan as a debtor.

Maybe the LDCs are solid debtors who will pay despite the absence of legal obligation. Perhaps a moral obligation is enough for them. The big 12 are Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Colombia, South Korea, Taiwan, Turkey, the Philippines, Thailand and Zaire. Mexico and Brazil lead the pack. The U.S. banks are owed \$11.6 billion by Mexico (not yet an oil profiteer itself) and \$11.1 billion by Brazil. The Arabs have been mercilessly grinding down the poor. Before the 1973-74 price hike, the oil-importing LDCs were running an annual current account deficit of about \$8 billion. Since then, they have run annual deficits of \$30 billion (1974); \$38 billion (1975); and \$26 billion (1976). The figure is expected to level off at a mere \$25 billion per year.

George Salem of Reynolds Securities reports that as of two years ago the 15 largest U.S. banks had total loans outstanding of \$235 billion, of which \$38 billion (16 percent) were to LDCs. But this \$38 billion was more than twice these banks' total capital. How good are the credits? Hans Mast, executive vice president of the Swiss Credit Bank in Zurich has said, "It would seem obvious that debt moratoria, with restructuring of debts, will increase in the next four years." Mast believes that since nothing has been done to solve the problem—oil overcharges causing LDC deficits—it has to get worse. And at some point the arrangement must topple.

A brief look at Zaire and Peru may give some idea of the strength of this credit. American and other banks thought Zaire was credit-worthy to the extent of \$500 million, a figure based mainly on its copper deposits. War in Angola, however, cut off the Benguela Railway, thereby sharply reducing copper production. In early 1975 Zaire stopped paying its public and private debts. The public creditors met at the Paris Club in June 1976. The defaulted debt was rescheduled over a 10 year period. The privately owned banks, offered a similar "stretch-out" on their debt by President Mobutu Sese Sese, refused. Instead, after Zaire met certain conditions, Citibank agreed to use its best efforts to raise a "new" loan of \$250 million. This was, of course, simply a rollover replacing part of the existing debt that would be paid. The banks think it is significant that they have avoided a "rescheduling." The Zaire situation remains very much in the air.

How easy is it to get the money out of a country once it has defaulted? Not easy at all; in fact, impossible. These are not wealthy countries that just don't want to pay. They are very poor countries that can't pay. Peru has defaulted on about \$1.2 billion in bank loans. The bankers and their front, the International Monetary Fund, insist upon payment. Payment can only come from increased taxes in one form or another. When taxes are increased to pay foreign lenders the result is rioting, martial law and death.

In South America it is common for the government to subsidize the price of necessities—milk and bread—to protect the low-income consumer. A reduced subsidy—increasing the price—would consequently amount to a tax increase making funds available for foreign bankers. In July 1977 Peru

announced price increases of 30 to 120 percent on milk, bread, cooking oil, gas and transit fares. The price increases were canceled after 20 people were killed in riots. Under renewed pressure from the bankers the increases were announced again in May 1978 and, once more, rioting swept 28 cities and towns, killing another 30 people. The military government responded by imposing martial law, postponing elections and suspending the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and assembly. Just last week the government announced a 20 percent increase in the price of gasoline and rice. A general strike was called, and once more the constitution was suspended and martial law was imposed.

Clearly the New York banks are captive to both Arab creditors and LDC debtors. They are vulnerable both ways. The Arabs may pull out or the LDCs may collapse.

The banks have no doubt that they will come out of this alive. But how? Could they prudently reduce their loan exposure and gradually disengage? No way. They are captives of their debtors. In early 1975, New York City's Deputy Mayor James Cavanaugh spoke for all large dead-beat debtors when he said: "The banks and we are a community of interest. If we go down, they go down." Cavanaugh has been wrong so far—the city and Cavanaugh went down, but the banks didn't. But the LDC figures dwarf the city debt held by the banks (maybe \$1.5 billion). How tough can you get with someone who owes you \$11 billion? In 1976, Peru—which owed the banks a mere one billion dollars—was able to pry another \$200 million out of them. The American banks had to consider Peru's prognosis dim in view of a 1975 foreign trade deficit of \$1.5 billion. But what choice did they have? One banker said during the Peruvian negotiations, "We're faced with the same decision as we are with a factory that is about to go bankrupt. Do you liquidate, or put in more money to see if you can make a go of it?" In December 1977, the Peruvians confessed they had not been able to make a go of it.

So why isn't David Rockefeller worried? Surely President Carter is not going to take over a defaulting country as the British and French foreclosed Egypt in the 1860s during the reign of Ismail Pasha. In those great days the lenders just walked in, took over the tax collection system and paid themselves. The banks remain supremely confident that the government will come to their rescue, but they expect the method of salvation will be more modern. The loss will be socialized by getting the American taxpayer to bear it. Perhaps it will be done through a front like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), but the banks are sure it will be done. After all, they reason, can the government stand aside while the U.S. banking system goes bankrupt?

A bail-out device called the Witteveen Facility went easily through Congress early last year. Under the auspices of the International Monetary Fund the Witteveen Facility provides \$10 billion for loans to countries hurt by the oil gouge. The countries can then pay off the New York banks. Chase Manhattan Bank insisted to the Senate Banking Committee that this was no bail-out. John Haley, executive vice president of Chase, denied that "a recommendation of increased official international credit is basically a plea for a 'bailout' of the major multi-national commercial banks. . . . What is at stake here is not the health of the major banks but rather the health of the world economy." The Wall Street Journal did not see it that way. It editorialized that an honest name for the proposal would have been "The Bankers Relief Act of 1977." The Journal said this "indirect approach" was "necessary to fool the taxpayers into thinking they are really helping the poor." The easily fooled taxpayer can look forward to

more Witteveen Facilities. But the problem is so massive. At some point the question will become "Who balls out the U.S.?" Does David Rockefeller? How about Saudi Arabia?●

## FEDERAL PRODUCTIVITY

### HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Civil Service of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee is holding a series of hearings on productivity in the Federal Government. With the constant pressures to hold down Government spending and employment, the focus on productivity is particularly timely. The opening statement delivered by Chairwoman PAT SCHROEDER at the first hearing on June 14 was an unusually perceptive analysis of the current state of productivity programs—and priorities—in the executive branch. I would like to draw it to the attention of the House:

#### OPENING STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE PATRICIA SCHROEDER

Welcome to the first of a number of sessions we foresee on Federal productivity and performance appraisal required by the Civil Service Reform Act. The most frequent single complaint I hear from my voters is that they get too little in return for their hard-earned tax dollars. Rightly or wrongly, they see the Federal government as the largest wastrel in the history of civilization. For the most part, they don't have any ideological objection to the government trying to feed the hungry, provide jobs for the unemployed, encourage energy production, stimulate economic development, or educate children. What they do have a problem with is the fact that the government spends so damn much money to do such a damn poor job.

One side of this problem is waste, fraud, and abuse. This Committee made a significant effort last year to force revelation and elimination of corruption by providing a place where Federal whistleblowers can safely go with evidence of wrongdoing. At the time, a major Inspector General program was instituted.

The other side of the problem is inefficiency, poor performance, and poor management. This problem is best confronted by embarking on a high-level full-scale program to improve the productivity of the Federal government. Now, high-level and full-scale do not necessarily mean, that we should blindly spend more money tagging it as productivity improvement. Rather there is sufficient talent and resources in government now to mobilize for the achievement of a major leap in efficiency, effectiveness, and service to the public.

Why hasn't the Federal government pursued a meaningful productivity program? Why aren't Federal managers interested in increasing the production of their work units?

It is impossible to estimate the total amount of money the Federal government has spent on productivity efforts in the past decade. Between program evaluation, Management by Objective, Zero Based Budgeting, the National Center for Productivity, and the Federal Productivity Council, the tax dollars plowed into this effort are very substantial. What have we gotten for this money?

I'll tell you one thing we have gotten: we've supported, in fine style, a whole gaggle of consultants and contractors who are glad to tell the government what they learned in business school, for a price.

We've received another thing as well: we've gotten a lifetime's supply of excuses for why a Federal productivity measurement and improvement effort cannot work. These excuses come in all colors, flavors, and sizes; which I think can be boiled down to six:

Excuse No. 1. "We don't have the resources to do it."

This excuse is the classic, used by government managers at all times for any purpose. It's a particularly serviceable excuse for a cost-conscious Congress. Unfortunately, it doesn't wash. Enormous sums have been spent, but they have been spent in the wrong place. Most agencies count something or another. But their workload indicators have about as much to do with how effectively the agency is doing its job as the casualty figures—bodycount—which we got during Vietnam had to do with whether we were winning the war. Furthermore, a productivity program need not be expensive. Canada has, over the past seven years, instituted what appears to be a first-rate program at a cost of \$13 million. That's million, not billion. Around here, \$13 million is mad money.

Excuse No. 2. "You can't measure productivity. Sure you can measure the productivity of a factory worker making widgets, but you can't for research and development. Besides, for jobs without tangible outputs, measuring productivity is a matter of subjectivity. Even if you can measure efficiency, you surely can't measure effectiveness."

This excuse greatly underrates the state of the art of productivity measurement. Surely output per person hour worked is the easiest productivity to measure. Nevertheless, major corporations and other governments have developed suitable methods of measuring productivity of less tangible outputs. It seems to me that if a program manager claims that the agency's output cannot be measured, Congress ought to shut down the program. In effect, the manager would be telling us, "We do good work here but I can't tell you exactly what it is." And, the Civil Service Reform Act made it clear that top managers should be judged in terms of quantified organizational output.

Excuse No. 3. "We're already doing it."

What the government is already doing is keeping bodycounts. Some are useful. But, to what use are they put? Are they used to save money for the government? Are they used to reward efficient and effective managers? Other workload indicators are worse than not useful; they encourage wasteful and nonproductive activity. In future hearings, we intend to demonstrate some of the perversions caused by poor productivity indicators. It is clear that the agency performance indicators have to be improved so that what is measured has to do with the ultimate intent of the agency and program. It is silly to have performance measures which do not relate to the reason the program exists. It is also foolish not to use the results to produce a more cost-efficient government.

Excuse No. 4. "There's no incentive to increase productivity."

The Civil Service Reform Act provided the single best incentive for increased productivity—performance appraisal. The performance appraisal system for Senior Executives is supposed to judge top managers on the basis of organizational as well as individual performance. I think the head of an agency should be judged on how well his or her agency does in meeting the goals Congress set out for it. That means a hypothetical HUD supergrade in Denver should be promoted or demoted on the basis of housing in Denver. At the very beginning, Senior Exec-

utives should be required to design and implement a workable, accurate, and quantified performance measurement system for their agency or unit within the first year. For non-Senior Executives, performance appraisal should be based on quantified measures of productivity which reflect the mission of the agency. To measure a procurement officer on the basis of speed of procurement, without concern for cost, is asinine. Performance appraisal has enormous potential. I would hate to see the agencies and OPM blow it.

Excuse No. 5. "You can't hold an employee accountable for things beyond his or her control."

That's right, but, on the other hand, you should not immunize officials from responsibility for their performance. No matter what the job is, there are some outside factors which always affect the outcome. A good productivity measurement system should find measures to examine an individual's influence on the outcome. Sure, the mythical HUD supergrade I just mentioned is restricted by rules and regulations, limited by money, obliged to give consideration to state and local governments, pressured by community groups, and guided by Washington. Nevertheless, a respectable productivity system will find a way to look at this employee's influence on housing in Denver.

Excuse No. 6. "There are all sorts of disincentives to measuring productivity, such as loss of budget and loss of status for increasing efficiency."

The Civil Service Reform Act should help reverse some of these disincentives by providing strong individual personal incentives for improving efficiency and effectiveness. I certainly hope that no manager is downgraded because he or she finds a way for the unit to do its job with fewer people. I understand that, in the past, grades were assigned based on the number of people supervised. Obviously, this is a disincentive which OPM can and should eliminate. So, disincentives can be reduced and incentives can be increased to encourage greater productivity.

The real reason the job hasn't been done is because there has not been sustained and strong interest from the top. The Office of Personnel Management, now being the lead agency, is the place I intend to watch to see that Federal productivity program in 1979 is not just a rehash of the past decade.

At our next hearing, on July 12, we will hear from employee organizations and other outside groups. Some of the most important and effective programs to increase productivity have come from collaboration between employee organizations and government managers. I certainly hope that OPM will work closely with these organizations in developing its productivity and performance appraisal plans.●

## THE NATIONAL ENERGY SELF SUFFICIENCY ACT OF 1979

### HON. DON BAILEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, I introduced the National Energy Self-Sufficiency Act of 1979. This legislation, or something like it, is the necessary foundation for the immediate development and permanent establishment of a private domestic synthetic fuel industry, large enough to make the United States an energy independent Nation soon.



The problems that make our current energy situation critical are well known to all of us. Last year, \$40 billion of American money went to foreign nations to purchase oil. Currently, 50 percent of U.S. oil consumption is based on imports. The cost of a barrel of imported oil averages \$18. Recent world spot market prices for imported oil have been between \$30 to \$40 per barrel. There is no end in sight.

The ripple effect of such price policies by foreign oil producing countries is already apparent. Inflation, unemployment, slow business growth, and an almost devastating psychological impact on the American public is evident. Most importantly, the national security of our country and our political system itself is threatened.

Today there is not one major synthetic fossil fuel production plant in our country.

My bill would provide the needed financial incentive for private industry and business to invest in such a synthetic fuel production effort.

Basically, the National Energy Self-Sufficiency Act of 1979 (H.R. 4484) would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to impose a duty on imported crude oil equal to the amount of the difference between the price of imported crude oil and the price of domestically produced synthetic fossil fuel. For example, using today's figures, at a cost of \$18 per barrel for imported crude oil and an estimated cost of \$25 per barrel for synthetic fossil fuel, the amount of the duty would be \$7 a barrel. The figures for both fuels and the amount of the duty, if any, would be determined on a monthly basis.

The money raised from the imposition of the duty would be placed in a trust fund, known as the Synthetic Fossil Fuel Fund.

The trust fund would be managed by a nine-member board appointed by the President of the United States. Its make-up would consist of three members of business and industry, three members of labor organizations, and three members would be appointed at large. The President would also select the board chairman.

The function of this board will be to make long-term, low-interest loans to private American industrial and financial concerns for the construction of facilities to produce synthetic fossil fuels. The loans shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of constructing such a facility. The overriding policy of the board in making loans shall be to encourage a broad-based and competitive synthetic fossil fuel industry by making loans to applicants from a variety of industrial and financial backgrounds and to as many applicants as is practicable.

The duty imposed on imported crude oil would make the production of synthetic fossil fuels economically feasible. At a current cost of about \$1 to \$2 billion for a synthetic fuel facility producing 50,000 barrels of such fuel a day, it is little wonder that private enterprise has been slow to pursue this alternative to our energy problem. The risk is just too great. However, my legislation provides the two-

prong incentive to this necessary massive investment. First, the duty on the imported crude oil makes the production of synthetic fossil fuel economically competitive in the domestic market. Second, the resulting trust fund from the duty would provide long-term, low-interest loans to cover up to half the initial enormous capital investment required for such a plant.

I am fully aware of the effect that the duty will have on the price of gasoline at the pump. Right up front, it may add 17 cents to 19 cents per gallon to current prices. But America must regain the vision and the foresight it once had in order for us to permanently solve our energy crisis—a crisis that is threatening the fundamental economic fabric of our society. There is no question that the independence of America's energy supply is of the utmost priority. In addition, the investment in these synthetic fossil fuel facilities can help an unemployment-plagued economy by providing new jobs in a growing industry, utilize our huge coal and shale reserves, and foster the growth of private business and industry. All this while keeping the Government out of the energy-producing business.

I ask that you help America back on the road to total energy independence and request your support of the National Energy Self-Sufficiency Act of 1979.

The following is a brief factsheet showing the amount of money that my bill will provide for potential capital investment in a synthetic fossil fuel industry:

#### NATIONAL ENERGY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT OF 1979

##### FACTSHEET, JUNE 1979

Average price of imported crude oil as per CRS, \$18 per barrel.

Estimated average price of synthetic fossil fuel—as per CRS, \$25 per barrel.

Difference of \$7 per barrel.

Historically, the cost of synthetic fossil fuel has been approximately 150 percent of the cost of crude oil.

The U.S. imports approximately 8 million barrels per day of crude oil from foreign sources. That is approximately 2.92 billion barrels of oil a year.

If a duty of \$7 per barrel was placed on this yearly import figure, the "Synthetic Fossil Fuel Fund" would be approximately \$20.44 Billion at the end of the first year.

##### POSSIBLE NUMBER OF PLANTS

Synthetic fossil fuel plants are estimated to cost between \$1 Billion and \$2 Billion each for plants able to produce the equivalent of 50,000 plus barrels of oil per day. Therefore, this legislation could theoretically provide funding, with matching private monies, for a minimum of 25 plus plants per year.

##### COST INCREASE AT PUMP

There are 42 gallons of oil in a barrel. The rule of thumb is that every \$4.20 increase in the price of oil equals a 10c price increase at the gasoline pump. This is assuming that there is no mark-up middlemen and retailers. However, the regulations and controls on refineries are loosening up and they will probably be allowed to pass on to consumers an approximate price increase of 2 to 5 cents a gallon. Therefore if the duty is \$7 per barrel, there will be an approximate increase of 17c per gallon plus an additional mark-up of 2-5c. Thus, the increase at the gasoline pumps would be approximately 19c to 22c per gallon. ●

#### THE EDUCATION FOR EXPORTING ACT

#### HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted a bill, the Education for Exporting Act, on behalf of myself, and Representatives SIMON of Illinois, ALEXANDER of Arkansas, MITCHELL of Maryland, NEAL of North Carolina, JONES of Oklahoma, LONG of Louisiana, VANIK of Ohio, and FRENZEL of Minnesota.

As you well know, the United States today is experiencing serious difficulties in the area of international trade. Our deficit last year was about \$30 billion, and this massive deficit contributed significantly to our domestic problems of employment and inflation.

There are, of course, many reasons for our current trade problems, some of which are self-correcting and some of which signify long-term weaknesses in our fundamental ability to compete in the world market. I believe that one factor that falls in the latter category of a basic weakness in our international competitive position is the relative provincialism of the U.S. business community.

We pride ourselves on our sophisticated technology and our management and organizational techniques—and rightly so. However, compared to a number of other countries such as Japan and Germany, our businessmen by and large focus on our own market. Few in our business community speak any language other than English with any degree of fluency. The feeling is pervasive that it is up to other peoples to learn English, rather than our responsibility to learn other languages and to understand other cultures.

The cost of this is great. It means that all too few of our firms think in terms of exporting; instead, they tend to concentrate on the domestic market. It means that of those that do export, all too few really understand overseas markets, and as a result their sales fall short of what they could be.

If the United States is to be really competitive, this situation will need to be changed. There will need to be a better blending of language and international skills in our business training. The Education for Exporting Act is intended to provide incentive for this to happen.

I believe it is particularly critical for our young people to have the opportunity to work overseas in other cultures in assisting American exporters and other commercial interests. At present, industry all too often attempts to teach an executive a foreign language and culture in midcareer. An executive, who perhaps has spent his career in engineering or accounting, tends to see this as a detour in his career path. What is needed is to blend foreign language and area studies with business training at an earlier point in the executive's career, while he is flexible and open to learning all he can about a foreign culture.

For its part, language and foreign area studies in the United States tends not to be commercially oriented. Graduates tend toward teaching, government, or pursuits other than business. In fact, however, foreign language and area studies have a great deal to offer business.

Over the long run, the programs to be carried out by the foundation established by this act should insure that some of our language and foreign area studies curricula are more tailored to business needs, and that more businessmen have studied foreign languages, cultures, and international business. Over the short run, programs of the foundation should also help our competitive position through the provision of market research, product servicing, and translation services to small and medium sized firms.

Let me emphasize that the programs to be carried out by this foundation are catalytic in nature. The role of the foundation is to provide the incentive for some long-run changes in our approach to business and language training. The foundation is not designed to replace programs now being effectively carried out in the private sector. Further, much needs to be done in the area of increased language training and strengthened U.S. programs for exporting. This bill is intended as only one step in these areas, and much more remains to be done in both of these areas.

Finally, let me emphasize that this bill has been designed very much with our current budget problems in mind. Clearly, this is not the time for expensive new programs.

This bill has been designed to minimize costs to the Treasury in the following ways: First, the foundation will be expected to charge for its services to the extent possible. Full cost recovery is not likely; however, the charges should be sufficient to insure that the foundation's programs fill a real need and to help lessen the burden on the Treasury; second, the foundation will be empowered to receive tax-free contributions from the private sector, and it is hoped that business in particular will contribute; third, most importantly, costs will be held down through the use of multipliers. It is expected that the foundation will work through organizations such as the American Chambers of Commerce overseas to deliver its services; fourth, finally, a 10-year sunset provision has been included. This will insure that this program is carefully reviewed for effectiveness, if it is extended.

Although this bill has been designed to minimize costs to the Treasury, I do not at this time have any budget estimates. This will have to be developed after hearings on this bill, when we are better able to estimate the optimum size of this program.

A summary of the sections of this bill follows:

Sec. 1. This Act may be cited as "The Education for Exporting Act."

Sec. 2. Describes the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 3. Establishes a quasi-public foundation, whose Board of Directors consists of one-third representatives of small and me-

dium-sized businessmen, one-third academia, and one-third Governmental. Describes the powers of the foundation and establishes provisions for auditing the foundation's records.

Sec. 4. Describes the programs that the foundation may carry out, including for example: Programs to sponsor work internships abroad for individuals in the offices of private organizations or companies engaged in promoting U.S. commerce, and programs to establish cooperative activities with educational institutions to provide low-cost translation or market research studies to private organizations engaged in international commerce.

Sec. 5. Establishes an International Education Trust Fund to finance the foundation.

Sec. 6. Authorizes appropriations to the Fund for fiscal year 1980 and the nine succeeding fiscal years.

Sec. 7. Defines the various terms used in the Act. ●

## HIPPOCRATIC OATH STILL NEEDED

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer an amendment to the upcoming Health Planning Act, H.R. 3917, dealing with the Hippocratic oath as revised in 1948 at Geneva as a result of the medical atrocities committed by Nazi medicine. Sad to say there is a need for this amendment even today. I think my colleagues will see why this amendment is needed after reading the enclosed material. Mr. Speaker, the material follows:

[From Time Magazine, June 25, 1979]

DOCTORS OF THE DEATH CAMPS—AN AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIST EXAMINES SOME MURDEROUS M.D.'s

Of all the troubling questions that linger from the Holocaust, one is as baffling today as it was when the first Allied soldiers stumbled upon the Nazi death camps: How could Germany physicians, heirs to Europe's proudest medical tradition, participate in mass slaughter and grisly human experiments?

No one has offered a convincing answer, certainly not the participants themselves. Only last week a West Berlin court convicted a former SS doctor of having murdered scores of inmates at the Mauthausen concentration camp in Austria—"sometimes out of pure boredom," said the judge. For Yale Psychiatrist Robert Jay Lifton, who has spent much of his professional life examining disaster, understanding the doctors of the Holocaust has now become a particularly grim challenge.

The author of a notable study of Hiroshima survivors, *Death in Life*, and other examinations of disaster, Lifton is writing two books: one on Auschwitz doctors, another on the medical profession under Hitler. As Lifton told TIME Associate Editor John Leo, collaboration by doctors was crucial to the Nazis' warped success. Says Lifton: "Doctors were key agents in the Holocaust. They are enormously implicated in the killing."

Lifton, 53, had been planning to write about the Holocaust for years, but this opportunity came by chance. Two years ago, the New York Times Book Co., a subsidiary of the newspaper, hired a German jurist as a consultant for a proposed book on Auschwitz. Lifton agreed to write it. Financed by the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Rockefeller Foundation, Lifton spent ten

months in Europe and the Middle East interviewing scores of German doctors, former Nazi bureaucrats and inmate doctors, mostly Jewish and Polish.

For Lifton, a Jew, these examinations were obviously painful. Even a generation later, Lifton found, many of the German doctors resorted to complicated mental gymnastics in discussing their Hitler days, and often seemed to be almost totally unreconstructed. Some saw themselves as idealistic Nazis who worked to restrain primitive elements within the movement. Others continued to feel the magnetism of Nazism. As Lifton explains, in an almost defensive clinical tone: "Often the former Nazi doctors seem to have two separate and functional selves—a conventional conservative postwar German attitude toward Nazism and its 'excesses' and a nostalgia for the excitement, power and sense of purpose of the Nazi days. For many, that intensity is so great that the Nazi belief system has not been given up."

Lifton concedes that most other German professionals also capitulated to Hitler, with certain heroic exceptions. What made the corruption of physicians so crucial to Hitler was that their support provided moral and scientific legitimacy for his crazed racial and biological notions. They did this in varying ways: by cooperating in sterilization and euthanasia programs, by counseling patients toward "racially pure" marriages, by expelling Jews from medicine, and by actually helping carry out the Holocaust. After all, it was doctors who supervised the "selections" at the concentration camps—deciding who would live to work, who would die in the gas chambers, who would become guinea pigs in the barbarous experiments justified as science.

Says Lifton: "Doctors were the embodiment of Nazi political and racial ideology in its ultimate murderous form. The killing came to be projected as a medical operation." Incredibly, some came to see genocide as a health measure. Said one: "If you have a gangrenous growth, you have to remove it." Another commented coldly that life at Auschwitz was as routine as "building a sewage project." Against the background of a eugenics movement that gained unfortunate respectability in some scientific circles in Europe and America during the '30s, says Lifton, "many doctors came to see themselves as vast revolutionary biological therapists." The third ranking doctor in the Nazi hierarchy admitted to him that he joined the party when someone fired his imagination by arguing that "Nazism is applied biology."

How did so many doctors manage to pre-empt over killings while viewing themselves as idealists? And how could they possibly continue to regard themselves in so favorable a light even today? Lifton concludes that they invoked two standard psychological forms of self-delusion: the first is "psychic numbing"; at Auschwitz, for example, doctors talked compulsively about technical matters to avoid confronting the reality of all the horrors around them. The second is "middle knowledge," a form of knowing and not knowing at the very same time. One doctor who had shipped large allocations of cyanide to the SS storm troopers who ran the camps seemed genuinely shocked to learn that it had been used to exterminate Jews and other people. Comments Lifton dryly: "He had worked very hard not to know."

Lifton sees another, more controversial psychological device at work. Because most cultures fear dying, one way to combat that dread is to look around for an enemy that symbolizes death. For the Nazis, it was the Jews, who had long been portrayed as Christ killers. Says Lifton: "If you view the Jews as death-tainted, then killing them seems to serve life." In Lifton's eyes, those who look



upon the Nazis or their medical henchmen simply as maddened sadists are on the wrong track. "Most killing is not done out of sadism, not even most Nazi killing," says Lifton. The reality of medical participation in the Holocaust, as he sees it, is even more chilling: "The murders are done around a perverted vision of life enhancement."

## DOCTORS OF INFAMY

The Reich Leader SS

Journal No. 1652/43

RF/Bn

Subject: Research into the Cause of Infectious Jaundice (Hepatitis Epidemica)

Reference Yours of June 1, 1943—File No.

420/IV/43—Journal No. 643, top secret

Top Secret!

To Reich Physician SS and Police, Berlin

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of

June 1, 1943.

1. I grant authorization for use in the experiments of eight criminals under sentence of death at Auschwitz (eight Jews of the Polish resistance movement sentenced to death).

2. I am in agreement that Dr. Dohmen should conduct these experiments at Sachsenhausen.

3. I share your view that an effective campaign against infectious jaundice would be of immense value.

(signed) H. HIMMLER.

Carbon copy to SS Lieutenant General Pohl, Berlin, for information.

SS Lieutenant Colonel.

In connection with a "Common Research Program on the Question of the Virus of Hepatitis," the consulting internist to the Army Medical Inspector, Prof. Gutzeit of Breslau, wrote to Prof. Haagen in Strassburg on June 24, 1944 (Doc. No. 124). Among other things he stated that he was trying "to create the possibility of carrying out the crucial experiment of transmission to man . . . However, certain precautions which I cannot mention in writing must be observed."

This letter from Gutzeit, Haagen answered on June 27, 1944, with the following passage:

For the time being I cannot yet conclusively answer your inquiry about the human experiments. As you know, I am working with Messrs. Kalk, Büchner,<sup>2</sup> and Zuckschwerdt. I have agreed especially with Mr. Kalk, of course, that we are to conduct such experiments with our material.

In this same letter Prof. Haagen mentions that the above-mentioned Dr. Dohmen was expected in Strassburg on July 15. On the same day he passed on Prof. Gutzeit's letter

<sup>1</sup> AUTHOR'S NOTE: The fact that the "crucial experiment" on human beings was actually carried out in Prof. Gutzeit's Breslau clinic is confirmed by a contribution from this clinic in the Munich Medical Weekly, 1942, p. 76ff. It was written by Dr. H. Voegt, resident physician at the clinic, and was entitled: "On the Etiology of Hepatitis Epidemica." The paper, by the way, is a very clear example of the tactics of obscuration as to whether the experiments were voluntary or not. In the case of a first test series voluntary participation is expressly emphasized; in a second, embracing six persons, this is not mentioned. Among the latter was a "thirty-year-old woman afflicted with a not very extensive tubercular infection of the lymph glands on the left side of the throat." She "drank, in a cup of soup, 100 cc of urine from patient B. and . . . (a little later) again about 25 cc from patient Sch." Even after the first dosage "the tubercular lymph-gland involvement began to flare up."

<sup>2</sup> PUBLISHER'S NOTE: Prof. Büchner, of Freiburg, later stated emphatically that he had no part whatever in the planning and conduct of Prof. Haagen's experiments on human beings, having solely examined a series of mouse-livers for him.

together with his answer to Prof. Kalk, who was on the staff of the Chief of the Air Force Medical Service:

[From Newsday, Feb. 19, 1978]

U.S. ADVISER DRAWS FIRE BY SUGGESTING TESTS FOR VACCINE ON RETARDED CHILDREN

WASHINGTON.—One of the government's chief health advisers has touched off an angry debate within the medical community by suggesting that retarded children be used as subjects for testing an experimental vaccine made from the diseased blood of hepatitis victims.

The hepatitis vaccine has not been licensed by the Food and Drug Administration. A spokesman for its manufacturer, Merck, Sharp & Dohme, said testing is in the early stages and the vaccine has not been proven safe or effective.

Although no researcher has yet accepted the proposal to test the vaccine on retarded children, there is no FDA rule against such experiments, according to agency spokeswoman Faye Peterson. While the agency has promulgated detailed guidelines to safeguard prisoners in medical experiments, for example, no similar rules have been issued that specifically cover retarded children.

The proposal to use retarded children as test subjects of the vaccine for the sometimes-fatal disease was made by a New York pediatrician, Saul Krugman, during a workshop on the experimental vaccine held two months ago at the National Institutes of Health near here. A distinguished hepatitis researcher, Krugman also is chairman of the vaccine board of the FDA's bureau of biologics, the chief federal advisory board for reviewing safety and effectiveness of new vaccines to determine whether they should be licensed.

Krugman, when asked at the Jan. 19 NIH workshop to summarize the material presented there, addressed the difficulty of finding suitable groups upon which to test the experimental vaccine. He said: "I would like to suggest that there are children throughout the United States who are on a waiting list to be admitted to various institutions for the retarded. . . . It would seem to me that this particular group at home, not in the institution, would be a logical group in whom to consider trials with hepatitis B vaccine." Krugman said he felt such tests would be "highly ethical," because the chances of a child's becoming infected with hepatitis after entering an institution for the retarded are very high. Crowded and unsanitary conditions and poor personal hygiene aid in spreading the disease.

Other medical authorities and government officials vehemently disagree with the proposal.

Carleen Bridgeman, executive director of the Institute for the Study of Medical Ethics in California, called Krugman's proposal "scary" and said, "It's using a captive subject . . . a child . . . unable to give informed consent."

Dr. John Cooledge said, "Dr. Krugman's idea is unconscionable . . . until safety is established. His suggestion is completely unethical." Cooledge, director of health services at the Georgia Retardation Center, is also a special consultant in the court-ordered cleanup of Willowbrook State School for the retarded in New York.

Part of the reason for the angry reactions from Cooledge and others is Krugman's controversial role in operating a research program at Willowbrook throughout the 1960s that involved infecting health retarded children between the ages of 3 and 10 with live hepatitis.

Krugman's early experiments, in which he measured among other things the amount of antibodies—natural defenses—the children developed after he infected them with the disease, provided great gains in scientific

knowledge, including the disease \* \* \* of two hepatitis viruses. "Krugman's series of studies at Willowbrook laid the groundwork for our current understanding of hepatitis," said Dr. Franklin Tyeryar, hepatitis program officer for the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. But Krugman's methods left a bad taste in the mouths of many scientists.

One of his notable critics is Dr. J. A. Morris, a virus expert who was the only federal official to raise his voice against President Ford's emergency measures in 1976 to inoculate Americans against the feared swine-flu epidemic that never materialized. Morris was fired from his job as director of the so-called "slow-latent" virus branch of the FDA's Bureau of Biologics, but the firing was overruled by Civil Service Appeals Review Board last week.

Commenting on the Krugman proposal, Morris said: "I think it's absolutely outrageous. . . . I say if it's worthy of experimenting on kids, then why not do it with healthy kids? And I would suggest we start with the children of the executives of Merck Sharp & Dohme." ●

CLARENCE J. VIPOND THE PATRIOT,  
CHURCHMAN, THE FAMILY MAN

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1979

● Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 1979, the funeral was held in Modesto, Calif. as a memorial tribute to a man for whom I had a profound measure of genuine admiration and respect—C. J. Vipond.

Here was a man who possessed the qualities we should all nurture: Courage, integrity, humility, compassion, concern, sincerity, selflessness, warmth, and patriotism.

His love for God and Country was only matched by his love for his wife and family—Vera Vipond; Lois Vipond Case; Del, Tonya and Lori Case; Robert L. and Lucy Vipond—who proudly referred to him as C. J., and Dad and Grandpa. My wife, Ollie and I have many fond memories of get togethers with Clarence and his family.

Wherever C. J. Vipond lived and worked, his presence left its mark. As a farmer, carpenter, businessman and churchman, he demonstrated a special quality and excellence in his production and performance. No task was too large or difficult for this very extraordinary man. The church and school facilities in Crescent City and Modesto will stand as living monuments to the skill and commitment of this dedicated and devoted christian.

His popularity, his genuineness and his down to earth personality were all traits that endeared him to all of his personal and business friends.

Many a farmer in California's central valley can thank "C. J." for their earned profit and productivity—due to the retractor C. J. Vipond and his great credibility.

You cannot build character and courage by taking away a person's initiative and independence.

Through his many initiatives, "C.J." brought joy, happiness, and independence to many families of California.

As he might say, "keep your nose clean so you can smell a phony."

His life was hard and challenging.

He was a graduate of the "College of Hard Knocks," learning his lessons well from his everyday experiences—believing that hardships teach fortitude.

He was true to his principles, the Golden Rule and the Ten Commandments.

In his everyday living, he recognized that it is not the leap at the start but the steady going that gets you there.

Here was a man who cared and shared in a way beneficial to all of mankind.

We all know, "It is right living which prepares us for safe and even joyous death."

His was a life of giving.

His was a life which was good.

His was a life of beauty.

God governs in the affairs of men.

Our brother, "C.J." Vipond, is now safely and peacefully—in the hands of the Lord.●

#### THE LIFELONG LEARNING ACT OF 1979

HON. WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Lifelong Learning Act of 1979, which is designed to improve access to higher education for nontraditional students of all ages.

This legislation is a revision of title I of the Higher Education Act, which now encompasses a broad range of community service and adult education programs administered by the States. Unfortunately, the existing title I lacks any clear focus or relationship to national needs, and has consistently failed to generate enthusiasm and adequate appropriations within the Congress.

It is in response to these inadequacies that I am sponsoring the Lifelong Learning Act of 1979. This revised title I program would target Federal funds to State and institutional programs for nontraditional students facing barriers to participation in higher education. In so doing, the Lifelong Learning Act establishes a national policy of making training and education opportunities available to all Americans, and directs federal resources to meet the challenges of declining student populations and changing educational needs.

The average college student today is hardly the 20-year-old male of two decades ago. Each year, our institutions are filled with increasing numbers of older Americans, men and women beyond the traditional age of the student who want or need additional education and training to cope with a rapidly changing world.

This growing trend of part-time, nontraditional students will profoundly alter the shape of higher education in the

years to come, and presents great challenges to the Congress in planning for our future. At present, while the demands on our colleges and universities are quickly swinging toward nontraditional students, Federal policies in higher education are still focused on the youthful student populations of years ago. The time for a new emphasis in higher education has clearly arrived.

The Lifelong Learning Act is a carefully drafted response to these emerging national needs. Drafted as a compromise initiative in lifelong learning, this legislation reflects a delicate balance of State, institutional, and noninstitutional needs which will draw all available resources into the lifelong learning process. The bill also provides new opportunities for participation by industry, business, and labor, and hopefully will serve as the basis for consensus on a new direction for Federal initiatives in community service and adult education.

Mr. Speaker, in this time of difficult budgetary restraint, I should stress that the Lifelong Learning Act requires no expansion of Federal expenditures in the realm of lifelong learning. The legislation simply redirects the present title I appropriation, \$16 million for fiscal year 1979, and targets that Federal aid to promote access for nontraditional students. The revision of title I is essential if we are to use Federal resources effectively to reach adult populations through institutions of higher education.

Looking ahead to the 1980's, one of our highest educational priorities must be to improve access for these neglected "students" who so greatly need the benefits of lifelong learning: The elderly, poor, handicapped, displaced homemakers, minorities, the unemployed, and underemployed. Increased access for these disadvantaged persons is the major goal of this legislation, and the proposal has already drawn broad support from the education community.

I now urge my colleagues in the House to join me in this new attempt to focus on the emerging needs of lifelong learning. Following is the text of the Lifelong Learning Act of 1979, which hopefully will serve to elevate the discussion on the future of higher education in America during the coming weeks:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Lifelong Learning Act of 1979".*

SEC. 2. Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

#### "TITLE I—LIFELONG LEARNING

##### "FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"Sec. 101. (a) The Congress finds that—

"(1) the rapid pace of social, economic, and technological change has created pressing needs for education programs which focus on the retraining and continuing education of nontraditional students in all stages of life;

"(2) in a changing society, many disadvantaged adults are restricted from advancement or self-sufficiency by lack of education during youth, while still others are restricted because of barriers such as age, sex, race, handicap, national origin, or economic circumstance;

"(3) educational opportunities in the

United States are limited primarily to Americans between the ages of 18 and 22, and institutions of higher education rarely have the capacity to meet the special needs of individuals who do not fall within the traditional student population;

"(4) with declining population growth rates, the future of education in the United States lies in its ability to respond to the challenges of lifelong learning, holding the promise of education and training which break the cycle of dependence for the disadvantaged;

"(5) the educational system of the United States holds vast potential for service in the realm of lifelong learning, but progress will be achieved only through an increased emphasis on planning, research, and coordination which more effectively utilizes existing resources at all levels of government; and

"(6) a successful national program of lifelong learning must marshal resources from a diverse range of higher education institutions, business, industry, labor, and other public and private organizations and institutions in order to meet the unique educational problems and needs of disadvantaged adults.

"(b) The Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States that to make education and training opportunities available to all citizens throughout life, and to remove any barriers to such opportunities posed by previous education or training, age, sex, race, handicap, national origin, or economic circumstances.

#### "COMPREHENSIVE STATE PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

"SEC. 102. (a) (1) (A) From 35 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 111, the Secretary shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the adult population of such State bears to the population of all the States, except that for each fiscal year no State shall receive from such sums less than \$50,000 for that year.

"(B) If the sums appropriated for any fiscal year are not sufficient to make payments of \$50,000 to each State then the amount of each State's allotment shall be ratably reduced. If additional sums become available for any fiscal year for which allotments have been so reduced, then such allotments shall be increased on the same basis as they were reduced, except that if the sums so available exceed the amount required to allot \$50,000 to each State such sums shall be allotted on the basis of population as required by paragraph (1).

"(2) If any State does not enter into an agreement satisfactory to the Secretary, or if in any fiscal year, any State does not have an agreement satisfactory to the Secretary pursuant to section 106, the Secretary shall reallot the funds that would have been allotted to such State to all other States with satisfactory agreements. Such reallocations to other States shall be made in proportion to their allotments pursuant to paragraph (1). Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated shall be deemed part of its allotment under paragraph (1) for such year.

"(3) (A) In accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, any State may file with the Secretary a request that a specified portion of its allotment under this title be added to the allotment of another State under this title for the purpose of meeting a portion of the Federal share of the cost of providing programs under this part.

"(B) If the Secretary finds that the programs with respect to which the request is made would meet the needs of the State making the request and that use of the specified portion of such State's allotment, as requested by it, would assist in carrying out



the purposes of this part, such portion of such State's allotment shall be added to the allotment of the other State under this part to be used for the purpose referred to in subparagraph (A).

"(b) (1) From the amounts allotted under subsection (a)—

"(A) each State, in the case of a State receiving an allotment of less than \$100,000, shall expend not less than 40 nor more than 50 per centum of such allotment, and

"(B) each State, in the case of a State receiving an allotment of more than \$100,000, shall expend not less than 30 nor more than 40 per centum of such allotment,

to carry out a program of comprehensive statewide planning for lifelong learning to insure effective and efficient use of all available resources from whatever source for lifelong learning in the State to improve access to persons within the State to lifelong learning opportunities. Such planning shall give particular consideration to the needs of disadvantaged persons for lifelong learning opportunities.

(2) The remainder of the funds allotted to a State which is not used pursuant to paragraph (1) may be expended by such State on activities to implement comprehensive statewide planning through grants to, or contracts with, appropriate institutions or agencies, or combinations thereof, within the State for the purposes of (A) improving access of persons (particularly of disadvantaged persons) in such State to lifelong learning opportunities and (B) encouraging better statewide coordination of various lifelong learning opportunities available and planned within the State, including those activities receiving Federal support under other statutes.

(3) Not more than 5 per centum of the funds allotted under this section may be used for purposes of the administration of programs under section 103. Such funds may be appropriately deducted from the amounts available under either paragraph (1) or (2) of this section, or under both such paragraphs.

#### "GRANTS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

"Sec. 103. (a) Thirty per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 111 shall be available to States with agreements under section 106, for grants to institutions of higher education including, but not limited to, community colleges.

"(b) From the sums reserved under subsection (a), the Secretary shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the adult population of such State bears to the adult population of all the States.

"(c) In order to receive funds under this section, States shall have carried out or be in the process of carrying out the requirements of section 102(b) (1) of this title and shall demonstrate the relationship between grants made under this section and the State planning required under section 102(b) (1).

"(d) Grants under this section shall be for the purpose of—

"(1) expanding and improving postsecondary continuing education programs and educational information and counseling services to help adults develop their potential, improve the well-being of their families and communities, and increase their ability to participate in civic, economic, and cultural activities;

"(2) making the instructional, research, and technical resources of postsecondary institutions available for diagnosing problems, identifying the knowledge, technical skills, and products appropriate to their solution, and implementing and evaluating programs to meet the needs of State and local governments, community groups, labor, and business;

"(3) developing strategies for obtaining long-term public and private support to assure that continuing education and community service programs will continue to be available to adults and community groups who would otherwise face programmatic and financial barriers to participation;

"(4) establishing policies and procedures for creating or expanding a labor education, training, and technical assistance program in one or more institutions of higher education, including the procedures to be used to develop cooperative arrangements for working with State level labor organizations—

"(A) to determine the specific nature and extent of the need for such services, and

"(B) to assess the interest and relative capacity of institutions of higher education in the State to apply their resources to meet the research, training, and developmental needs of workers and of officers and members of labor organizations.

#### "SPECIAL PURPOSE GRANTS

"Sec. 104. (a) From 30 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 111, the Secretary shall make grants and enter into contracts with public and private agencies, institutions and organizations, business, labor, and with individuals.

"(b) Grants and contracts under this section shall be for—

"(1) assessing, evaluating the need for, demonstrating, developing, and disseminating alternative methods to improve the access of disadvantaged persons to life-long learning opportunities;

"(2) supporting activities and providing technical assistance, where necessary, designed to eliminate inequities with regard to age in the operation and policies of the educational system;

"(3) identifying and disseminating information about innovative education and training practices which offer promise of providing models for Federal, State, local, and institutional policies that would enhance the availability and effectiveness of lifelong learning opportunities; and

"(4) assisting schools for education and other institutions which provide for teacher education to retrain faculty, teachers, counselors and others so that they become effective educators of the new clientele of students, especially disadvantaged adults who wish and need to learn throughout their lifetime.

"(c) No grant or contract may be awarded under this section to any applicant unless the Secretary has provided the State agency designated pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 106(a) an opportunity to comment on the relevance of the proposed grant or contract to the comprehensive statewide planning undertaken pursuant to section 102(b) (1) for at least 30 days. The Secretary shall make an explicit determination in writing prior to the award of any grant or contract regarding the extent to which the grant or contract relates to or is consistent with such comprehensive statewide planning.

#### "FEDERAL LIFELONG LEARNING ACTIVITIES

"Sec. 105. (a) From 5 centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 111, the Secretary shall carry out a program of planning, research, coordination and information dissemination related to lifelong learning. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall—

"(1) foster improved coordination of Federal support for lifelong learning programs across Federal agencies;

"(2) Establish a clearinghouse for information regarding lifelong learning, including the identification, collection, and dissemination to educators and the public of existing and new information regarding lifelong

learning programs which are or may be carried out and supported by any department or agency of the Federal Government or the private sector;

"(3) review present and proposed methods of financing lifelong learning from public and private sources, including the administrative features of each, to determine the extent to which each promotes lifelong learning for the general public and the extent to which each serves to encourage participation in lifelong learning by those segments of the adult population not now enjoying equal opportunities for learning;

"(4) submit to the President and the Congress not later than October 1, 1982, an evaluation of the several hundred existing Federal programs supporting lifelong learning to determine the degree to which existing statutory authorities and funding levels encourage or discourage broad access of students and potential students to lifelong learning opportunities;

"(5) report to the President and the Congress on the progress of activities under this section by January 1 of each year through 1985; and

"(6) convene a Lifelong Learning Conference in 1983 for the purposes of assessing the progress of these activities, continuing the development of Federal lifelong learning policy and developing any necessary legislative recommendations for the improvement of this title, before the reauthorization of this title by the Congress in 1985.

#### "STATE AGREEMENTS

"Sec. 106. Any State desiring to receive its allotment of funds under sections 102(a) and 103(a) shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may reasonably require to insure proper and efficient expenditure of Federal funds allocated to the State and under this title. Such agreement shall—

"(1) designate as the State agency to receive, and to be responsible for expenditure of the State's allotment, the State agency responsible under State law for comprehensive statewide planning for postsecondary education, except that such State agency may delegate to another State agency or institution responsibility for specific implementation activities to be carried out in accordance with the comprehensive statewide planning conducted to pursuant to section 102(b);

"(2) set forth policies and procedures to coordinate any activities undertaken pursuant to section 102(b) with State programs under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, the Older Americans Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the Vocational Education Act, the Career Education Incentive Act, and with all other state level activities assisted by the Higher Education Act of 1965 (including Educational Information Centers) and other Federal laws intended to provide outreach, guidance, counseling, and educational and occupational information to persons within the State;

"(3) set forth the means to be used, consistent with State law, by the State agency designated pursuant to paragraph (1) to achieve active participation and involvement in the comprehensive statewide planning process of students and potential students (particularly disadvantaged persons) and existing and potential providers of lifelong learning opportunities and services within the State, including business, labor, educational institutions, State and local governments, community and voluntary agencies and other programs (including federally funded programs) serving adult learners, and including the use of advisory councils or other mechanisms appropriate to the State;

"(4) set forth the policies and procedures

to be followed in granting Federal funds to institutions of higher education and combinations thereof, including the procedures to be used—

"(A) to determine the availability of and need for continuing education and community service programs;

"(B) to assess the commitment and the capacity of particular institutions to provide continuing education and community service programs;

"(C) to encourage the development of programs whereby institutions of higher education, in combination with other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, apply their resources to expand and improve continuing education and community service programs; and

"(D) to conduct and make use of, periodic evaluations of the programs carried out under sections 102 and 103.

"(5) set forth policies and procedures designed to insure that Federal funds made available under this title will not supplant State or local funds, or funds of institutions and organizations within the State, but will supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the amounts of such funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for programs of access to, or coordination of, lifelong learning programs."

#### "APPROVAL OF AGREEMENTS

"Sec. 107. The agreement between a State and the Secretary pursuant to section 106 shall be entered into by the Secretary if the Secretary finds that the information and assurances provided by the State meet the requirements of such section. Such an agreement shall remain in effect for the duration of the authorization of this title, and shall be subject to amendment from time to time as required by changes in either Federal or State law or regulations, or by changes in the information and assurances provided by the State pursuant to section 106.

#### "PAYMENTS

"Sec. 108. Payment under this title with respect to the allotment of funds under sections 102 and 103 shall be made to the State agency designated pursuant to section 106 (1). Payments under this title from a State's allotment with respect to the cost of carrying out the activities set forth in sections 102 and 103 shall not exceed two-thirds of such costs for each fiscal year through 1985.

#### "NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON LIFELONG LEARNING

"Sec. 109. (a) (1) The President shall, within ninety days of enactment of the Lifelong Learning Act of 1979, appoint a National Advisory Council on Lifelong Learning (hereafter referred to as the "Advisory Council"), consisting of—

"(A) one representative each of the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Labor, Interior, State, and Housing and Urban Development, and of such other Federal agencies having extension education responsibilities as the President may designate;

"(B) twelve persons, not in the employ of the Federal Government, who are knowledgeable in the fields of lifelong learning, State and local officials, or other persons having special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to community problems; and

"(C) five persons representative of the general public including students and potential students, particularly disadvantaged persons.

"(2) The President shall designate a Chairman from those persons not in the employ of the Federal Government. The Advisory Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less often than twice a year.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall advise

the Secretary in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State agreements under section 106 and policies to eliminate duplication and to effectuate the coordination of programs under this title and other programs offering lifelong learning activities and services.

"(c) The Advisory Council shall review the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported lifelong learning programs, including community service programs, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports, commencing on March 31, 1981, of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title and other Federal laws relating to lifelong learning activities) to the Secretary and to the President. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

"(d) In carrying out its functions pursuant to this section, the Advisory Council may utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head of such agency, subject to section 448(b) of the General Education Provisions Act. The Advisory Council shall continue to exist until the programs authorized by this title are terminated.

#### "DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 110. (a) As used in this title—

"(1) the term 'adult' means any individual who 18 years of age or older;

"(2) the term 'community service program' means activities and services provided by postsecondary institutions to national, State, and community groups and organizations to assist in the diagnosis of problems, the identification of knowledge, technical skills and products appropriate to their solution, and the development, delivery, and evaluation of programs for using these resources to address identified needs;

"(3) the term 'continuing education program' means postsecondary instruction and support services designed to meet the educational needs and interests of adults, including the expansion of available learning opportunities for disadvantaged adults who are not adequately served by current educational offerings in their communities;

"(4) the term 'disadvantaged persons' means adults who, because of circumstances of age, sex, low-income, handicap, minority status, status of unemployment or underemployment, lack of education or other significant barrier have been prevented from obtaining equal educational opportunities.

"(b) For purposes of sections 102(a) (1) and 103(b), the adult population of a State and of all States shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce.

#### APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"Sec. 111. To carry out the purposes of this title, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary through fiscal year 1985." ●

### SUNSET CIVIL SERVICE AGENCIES

## HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress went firmly on record last year in favor of protecting Federal employees

who blow the whistle on illegality, fraud, waste, mismanagement, or dangers to public health and safety. As part of the Civil Service Reform Act, Congress created a Merit Systems Protection Board to serve as a court for Federal employees and a special counsel to investigate and prosecute prohibited personnel practices. Now, I have learned that the administration is seriously underfunding these agencies, jeopardizing the protections which Congress worked so long to mold. This morning, at hearings on bills I introduced to sunset the civil service agencies, I spelled out the situation with regard to these agencies. For the benefit of my colleagues, I ask to put my statement for those hearings in the RECORD.

#### OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE PAT SCHROEDER

Welcome to today's hearing on two bills I introduced to sunset the civil service agencies of government, unless the Congress affirmatively votes to reauthorize them. Tomorrow, these hearings continue with testimony from outside groups interested in the implementation of Civil Service Reform. These hearings focus on H.R. 3751 and H.R. 3752, bills to place the civil service agencies on expiring authorizations for specific sums. Nevertheless, the hearings provide an excellent opportunity for some good, old-fashioned Congressional oversight.

One of the main things we are talking about today is money; how many scarce tax dollars should be used for the various, competing demands of Civil Service Reform. I was truly disheartened to see the President's budget request for the civil service agencies and to infer from that the priorities the President wants to set. The lion's share of the money went to the Office of Personnel Management and crumbs went to the Merit Systems Protection Board, the Special Counsel, and the Federal Labor Relations Authority. OPM got \$.25 for every \$1 the other three units got together.

The President's proposal was particularly distressing in the funding of the Merit Board and the Special Counsel. These officials are the ones who are supposed to protect Federal whistleblowers from reprisal. The reason I was so upset about the President's budget request for these units was because Jimmy Carter had declared himself a strong supporter of whistleblower protection. In the campaign, Carter invoked the sad legacy of Ernest Fitzgerald and vowed to prevent history from repeating itself. In proposing Civil Service Reform, he remembered his campaign promise and suggested giving whistleblowers their first statutory protection. In signing both the Inspector General and the Civil Service Reform legislation last October, President Carter singled out the whistleblower protections for special praise.

Sometime over last winter, the President's enthusiasm for protecting whistleblowers apparently waned. He proposed a budget for MSPB and the Special Counsel which was so tight as to render illusory the protections of the statute. The President's budget merely transferred minimal funds out of the old Civil Service Commission to fulfill the pre-existing functions transferred under the Reorganization Plan. The strong, new powers which Congress conferred on the Special Counsel, the Merit Board, and the Federal Labor Relations Authority were ignored.

The General Accounting Office noticed this inadequate funding and wrote a strong letter to Senator Ribicoff on April 20 stating, "In our opinion, with their present staffing and funding, the Board and particularly the Special Counsel do not have adequate resources to establish full operations and effec-



tively carry out the duties and responsibilities assigned to them under the Civil Service Reform Act. As a result, the intent of the legislation cannot be achieved."

What the Comptroller General is saying is clear: Jimmy Carter wants to protect Federal employees against reprisal, but he refuses to pay the bill for it. What the President is doing reminds me of the fourth act of Verdi's *Othello*. In that act, *Othello* sings of his great love for Desdemona while he is strangling her to death. Like *Othello*, Jimmy Carter is telling the country of his love for whistleblower protection while, at the same time choking the agencies responsible for providing this protection.

Fortunately, the House Appropriations Committee has undone some of the damage by increasing the funding of the Special Counsel for fiscal year 1980 from \$1,994,000 to \$3,250,000. Similarly, the budget of MSPB was upped from \$9,125,000 to \$10,500,000. Even with these increases, these agencies, as well as the Federal Labor Relations Authority, will be operating on extremely tight budgets in the coming year.

So, we have the agencies up here today to tell us what they have done, what they plan to do, how much it will cost to do it, and whether Congress should require by statute that they be reauthorized periodically. With that, let me introduce our first witness, Ruth Prokop, the Chair of the Merit System Protection Board.

#### SPIZZ SINGER'S GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

#### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, July 8, 1979, marks the 50th anniversary of Spizz Singer's service to the public as a radio broadcaster. On that day, Illinoisans from Springfield and the surrounding communities will gather to pay tribute to this pioneer of radio, who has contributed such distinguished, innovative leadership throughout all those years.

Spizz Singer's radio career began in Springfield, Ill., in October 1928. Those were the years of radio's infancy, and Spizz soon became popular for the new form of entertainment he brought to his listeners.

Always innovative, Spizz originated the first "Man on the Street" broadcast. He pioneered farm broadcasting in downstate Illinois and reported to his listeners on the activities of the Illinois State Fair. In fact, he was the first broadcaster to originate live shows at the State Fair.

In addition to radio broadcasting, Spizz also brought live entertainment to Springfield, both at local theaters and in public parks. He served in civic clubs, on civic improvement associations, senior citizens organizations, and a host of other community oriented projects.

In 1959, he organized a delegation of 17 agriculture leaders for a tour of Russia. He broadcast live news stories from the Soviet Union and upon his return gave over 250 lectures and slide presentations about the trip. As a result, he was invited to join the International Platform Association along with speak-

ers such as Drew Pearson, Lowell Thomas, and Art Buchwald.

The American radio broadcasting industry owes much to the leadership and innovation of Spizz Singer. On this, his golden anniversary in broadcasting, I salute Spizz Singer for his many contributions to the betterment of his community. ●

#### THE SOVIET UNION'S VALUES

#### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times recently published two articles about the Soviet Union, written by David K. Shipler, who recently completed a 4-year tour as a Times reporter in that nation. I found the articles of great interest for they deal with the fundamental differences between Soviet society and our own.

These differences are rooted in values, in ideals of personal and political conduct. As Shipler points out, the central value in the Soviet Union is collectivism. Russians quite simply cannot understand our brand of individualism. They think it is anarchic, sloppy, and dangerous.

This was brought home to me during a recent tour of the Soviet Union as a member of a House delegation. In one meeting with a high-level Soviet official, the discussion concerned nuclear power. The official seemed puzzled that we in the United States should have antinuclear demonstrations. "This thing has been argued," he said. "It has been debated. Now it has been settled. Why do you then have these demonstrations?" I tried as best I could to explain to him that in the United States open debate, even after a matter is "settled," is a primary value and is, in fact, central to our very existence as a nation. He listened politely but obviously did not understand.

There is one passage in the Times' articles that strikes me as saying something important about the relationship between the Soviet Union and our Nation. The article states:

Many also privately acknowledge their fondness for the United States, though it is usually an admiration for the abundance and ambience, rarely the ideals.

But it is precisely our ideals that have brought about the abundance and ambience the Soviets admire. How can they admire our achievements without at the same time honoring the values such as freedom of the individual, free speech, and free enterprise that made it all possible?

Ideas have consequences, as a wise man once said. The Soviet Union has had to depend on our technology, our credits, and our wheat for over 60 years primarily because the Soviet values do not inspire individuals to risk and be innovative. Our ideas and our ideals, not just our material abundance, are proof of our systems superiority.

At this time I wish to insert in the RECORD, "Soviet Collectivism Is Giving

Way Toward Private Interest" and "Russians Covet Affluence of United States But Are Wary of Its Political Setup," published in the New York Times, June 13-14, 1979.

#### SOVIET COLLECTIVISM IS GIVING WAY TO TREND TOWARD PRIVATE INTEREST

(By David K. Shipler)

Moscow.—The Soviet Union has always put great importance on the collectivist ethic, teaching children to submerge their individual desires and defer to the broader interests of the group. Now a subtle cross-current has developed, not an American-style individualism but a tentative withdrawal into private life that some Russians believe has begun to erode the population's social conscience and ideological commitment.

The trend is visible in literature, drama, sociology, film, education and the attitudes of people as they go about their work. Although it has not been enough to undermine the dominance of collectivism in shaping political attitudes, it has begun to provoke expressions of concern by Communist Party officials.

"When I first came here in 1931," said an American Communist who still lives in Moscow, "it seemed to me that the country was just plain enthusiastic about everything. They thought the harder they worked, the richer the country would get and the more they'd get out of it. Now the general trend seems to be to do as little as possible and to bear as little responsibility as possible."

"Everyone just tries to live for himself," a young Russian remarked.

The "kollektiv" of schoolmates or coworkers is still an important instrument of social control. In the classroom and the factory, it provides the teacher and the manager with a way of manipulating peer pressure to make deviance costly and painful, encouraging everyone to keep his head down. But whether it produces citizens who really identify with the larger group is open to question.

"It is stronger than many in the West believe," said a Soviet Communist Party member, "but weaker than many here believe. There is a feeling of belonging to something larger, but as for the idea that the individual is nothing, no, that's no longer true."

Indeed, the individual has loomed rather large in recent Soviet writing. The most popular works today are neither those of broad social criticism nor of the synthetic heroism that turns assembly lines and battlefields into poster art.

Rather, they are the novel, and short stories, the films and plays that reach into the intimate world of the family, that explore regions of personal anguish and grief and love, and do not always end happily. Some are serious works, some are melodramas, most make no gesture toward glorifying the achievements of Communism.

Yuri V. Trifonov writes about Soviet urban life with such honesty that one Russian compared reading his works to "looking through a keyhole at people." His short story, "The Exchange," a searing account of hatred and greed in a family, runs as a play in Moscow to packed houses.

Valentin Rasputin, widely considered the most talented writer in the country, is known for the beauty and pain with which he captures life among the Russian peasantry. Fyodor Abramov has produced some powerful stories of personal suffering in the countryside. Bulat Okudzhava, a balladeer and novelist, writes of a Russia that has passed and of private lives and private trials.

#### A CONTRAST AT THE THEATER

The Communist Party secretary of the city of Moscow, Viktor V. Grishin, complained about this trend in a recent speech at a writers' meeting, lamenting the absence of

Communist heroes in contemporary literature who could act as models for Soviet youth. Many Russians think it is the absence of heroes in real life that has diminished idealism and turned people inward.

The heroic portrayal of workers, soldiers and revolutionaries persists on stage and screen, especially in epics on the Soviet victory in World War II. But the most popular recent film is not on that theme. Called "Strange Woman," it is the story of a woman who possesses all the tangible ingredients of happiness and who abandons her husband in search of love.

"To hell with love," the husband exclaims. "People are busy with work, work—understand? Everybody goes crazy about this love as if nothing more important existed!"

When Yuri Trifonov's "The Exchange" is playing at the Taganka Theater, scores of people hover outside hoping to buy extra tickets as the audience arrives. But when a patriotic pageant of war and heroism based on Leonid I. Brezhnev's wartime memoir "Malaya Zemlya" was performed recently at another central Moscow theater, people stood outside trying in vain to sell tickets they did not want; inside, there were many empty seats.

There need be no dichotomy between collectivism and private life. It is a matter of shading and emphasis, a question of what depth collectivist values can have when other currents run through a society.

The collective is still a sacrosanct idea of Soviet Communism, one that springs out of the Russian culture and finds reinforcement in modern ideology. The notion that a person should work hard not for his own gain but for the good of the society is a strong ideal here, and perhaps as unattainable as any ideal anywhere.

#### FITTING IN IS IMPORTANT

Much importance is attached to a person's getting along with the group; loners are rarely admired, no matter how brilliant. Conformity is valued, individualism and solitude are not. Russians talk to strangers on trains, sit in the front seats of taxis, accept being scolded in public by passers-by for failing to bundle their children adequately against the cold, for wearing shabby clothes, for driving dirty cars.

The school is the main crucible of collectivism. Teachers' manuals mandate efforts to instill a collective consciousness in children by making much of their behavior and academic performance subject to approval by other children as well as the teacher.

One method is to divide a class into rows or small groups of five or six who compete as teams in schoolwork, obedience, neatness and the like. The fate of one is thereby bound up with the fate of all: Any excellent student pulls the whole team up, and any laggard pulls it down. The children are encouraged to help the slow pupil and scold the lazy one. "It works quite well," a teacher said.

The entire class's scorn and pressure are sometimes used against wrong-headed youngsters. A Moscow teen-ager recalled once having an "incorrect" reaction to a moralistic, patriotic tale of a Young Pioneer during the war who refused the orders of German soldiers to take off his red neckerchief and was shot for it.

#### GIRL SAID WHAT TEACHER WANTED

"I said in my composition that the boy was foolish," the teen-ager said. "What did he accomplish? I didn't understand what was heroic about him."

"The teacher read the composition in class. Didn't say who wrote it and asked the class's opinion. Somebody said that what I wrote was right, somebody said it wasn't right. You could feel she wanted the class to say it was wrong, so a girl stood up and said it was all wrong."

It is common in Soviet schools for children to judge their peers as they think their teachers want them to—class leaders are usually what American students used to call "administration flunks." And this sets the pattern for adulthood, when collectives of factory workers and Communist Party members act at official meetings as their superiors expect.

Sometimes such formal collectivism goes no deeper than the surface; some youngsters have reported that in schools it is all performed cynically, with laughter as soon as the teacher leaves the room.

#### EXCESSES ARE CONDEMNED

Furthermore, from teacher to teacher and school to school, emphasis on the collective varies. Some pursue the theme with alacrity, some with indifference, some use it as a stern instrument of discipline, some recognize the danger of excess.

Occasionally, excesses are condemned. A film dramatizing the overzealous and destructive use of peer pressure against a schoolboy was shown recently on Moscow television. A play for young people about juvenile crime illustrates the harmful effects of a hostile collective on a boy who needs help and support.

"We are more concerned with what the collective thinks of us than what our parents think," said a law student as his companion, a history major, nodded in agreement.

The same thing might be said of young people everywhere, except that Soviet society works hard to insure that peer pressure pushes in the right directions. One result is hypocrisy—the tendency to speak and vote at meetings as is expected but to think otherwise.

#### A U.S.-SOVIET COMPARISON

A telling piece of research in the mid-1960's compared the willingness of Soviet and American children to misbehave in the face of their peers. As reported by Urie Bronfenbrenner in his book "Two Worlds of Childhood," the Americans' behavior was good when they thought that only their parents would be aware but worsened when they thought their classmates would know.

"Soviet youngsters were just the opposite," Mr. Bronfenbrenner wrote. "In fact, their classmates were about as effective as parents and teachers in decreasing misbehavior."

The trouble with such studies is that they often tap only the formal, contrived dimension of Soviet life and rarely the more spontaneous, natural impulses. The collective has its official aspect, as in a classroom of children doing the teacher's bidding in denouncing misbehavior, and also its street-wise facets, as in a gang of teen-agers vandalizing automobiles.

Juvenile crime, high divorce rates and other ills of modern urbanization have prompted sociologists and educators to look again at the family as a key social institution, to stress the need for its health and stability and to move far away from the notion prevalent in the first decade after the revolution, based on Marx and Engels, that the family would disappear, that communal life would replace the individual household.

So-called communal apartments in which each family has its room and shares a kitchen and bath with others are seen today as anachronisms and signs of poverty. The result of an acute housing shortage and not ideology, they are rapidly being replaced throughout the country with high-rise, separate flats.

Similarly, childrearing has not been turned over to the state. Even though virtually all able-bodied women have jobs, most take full advantage of long maternity leaves, then deposit the children with grandmothers during working hours. Soviet statistics are imprecise, but it appears that only about 17 percent of children under 3

years old are in day nurseries, and about 30 percent of all preschoolers are in nurseries or kindergartens.

There is considerable evidence that although collectivism has reduced political deviance, it has not worked well in other areas.

Since the collective is a basic unit in industrial organization, with factory brigades and teams paid bonuses on the basis of group performance, the ideal has held that people would throw themselves into their jobs for the common good, respect joint property and shun personal gain.

#### THE GOALS ARE NOT MET

But some workers say that the real ethic on the job is to work slowly so you do not make others look bad, to regard the society's property as dispensable because it belongs to no one and to make as much individual profit as possible, often illegally. Beneath the surface, collectives are also frequently the settings for gossip rivalries and backstabbing, Russians say.

Nor does the collectivist ethic seem to have bred a strong social conscience. A group of teen-age activists in Moscow's Komsomol, the Young Communist League, met several months ago with an American correspondent who asked what they saw wrong in the world that they wanted to set right. All their answers were aimed at what they perceived as American ills: crime, racism, the rise of fascism, the arms race.

Asked to say something about their country, they were silent. With the question rephrased to allow positive statements about what they hoped to do for their own country, there was again silence. Finally a boy answered mechanically, "We want to build Communism."

Westerners who live in Moscow for a time begin to see that Russians have a deep love of their country but not necessarily for their countrymen. They can be blindly patriotic and frequently uncharitable.

A Muscovite standing in a meat line recently watched as a young man, obviously from a village where there was no meat at all, bought 10 kilograms (22 pounds), probably to take home to his family. Because of favoritism and poor distribution, Moscow has better supplies than the countryside, and many peasants shop in the capital.

"The old woman behind me started to grumble," the Muscovite recalled. "Why so much?" she said. "They should give only one kilo each. Why don't they work better on their own farms so they have enough meat? Why do they have to come to Moscow?"

#### RUSSIANS COVET AFFLUENCE OF U.S. BUT ARE WARY OF ITS POLITICAL SETUP

(By David K. Shieler)

Moscow.—Soviet society has been exposed to more American influence during this decade of détente than in other periods since the Bolshevik Revolution, deepening the ambivalence that Russians have historically felt toward the West.

Many Russians have become well-read in American literature, and millions get their news from Voice of America broadcasts. Painters, dancers and writers sometimes look to the West for inspiration. And a great infatuation has developed for the material goods and popular styles of the United States, a craving for jeans, rock, chewing gum and the like.

But all this contact has not generated much pressure for change inside the Soviet Union. For reasons of Russian culture that go back before the Revolution, Western ideas of democracy remain alien, incomprehensible and unattractive to broad masses of Russians, much as the Russian ethic of collectivism is hard for an American to understand and admire.

Deeply rooted values that have prevailed



since Czarist times foster a mystical respect for central authority, a yearning for order and unanimity, a distaste for disagreement and diversity, a dread of any turmoil of ideas. From this perspective, American society looks chaotic and frightening.

Democratic ideas are also repelled by a smothering blanket of propaganda that authorities use to denigrate the American system and by Russians' cynicism about all high-sounding platitudes, including their own. But the deeper values are the most decisive, and they are not merely imposed from above; they grow from within the society and help produce the kind of political structure that exists.

The result is a society highly resistant to infection by the principles of individualism and personal freedom. This is no longer a place of pervasive terror, as under Stalin, yet in the 21 years since cultural and scientific exchanges with the United States began, the thousands of Russians and Americans who have worked in each other's countries have had only superficial impact. The old dream that contact with open societies would open the Soviet Union has faded.

The Moscow teen-agers who sport dungaree jackets with American flags sewn on the sleeves are rarely enchanted with American-style free elections. The millions who listen to the Voice of America seldom see virtue in a free press. Many more risk imprisonment for illegal dealings in American goods than are willing to face jail for advocating free speech. Few believe that free elections, a free press and free speech exist anywhere. "We need to fight for freedom," a young Russian remarked, "but basically we fight for comfort."

Even many people in a position to be drawn toward democratic principles are governed by the ancient impulses of unanimity and order. Dissidents who take heavy risks in struggling for human rights, and who count on publicity and support in the West, rarely turn out to be civil libertarians. Many are as likely as Communist Party members to resent differences of opinion within their own ranks, and some who have emigrated are truly bothered by the babble of voices in the West, seeing public argument as a sign of weakness.

#### EVEN EXPERTS HAVE DIFFICULTY

Soviet experts on American affairs also find it hard to grasp American values despite their frequent visits to the United States and their privilege of reading American publications banned to ordinary Russians. Partly because they must be ideologically reliable to hold such posts, they often fail to appreciate certain features of American life important to their analyses, such as the role of individualism or pluralism in politics.

In odd ways, however, the West in general and the United States in particular are factors in the Soviet Union's intellectual environment. Because the Voice of America is no longer jammed, the censored Soviet press must report and comment on events it used to ignore. Because Soviet writers can find publishers in the West for works rejected here, the censor has assumed some flexibility.

The West is still a safe haven for Russians who think differently, a place from which they can expound views that filter back into the rarified atmosphere of the Soviet intelligentsia. Although there is no émigré or exile today who can be compared to Aleksandr Herzen, the 19th-century liberal who lived in London, or to Lenin, who spent years in Western Europe writing and organizing before the Revolution, the works of those now living abroad are smuggled in and avidly read.

#### STUDY OF U.S. OFFERS SOME FREEDOM

Furthermore, many Soviet scholars and journalists enter the field of American affairs

precisely because they are freer to use their critical faculties to probe and analyze and question than if they were examining their own society.

Many also privately acknowledge their fondness for the United States, though it is usually an admiration for the abundance and ambience, rarely the ideals. Those who find the West too attractive are isolated and rejected by the Soviet system as reflexively as a living organism combats a piece of foreign matter.

In fact, officialdom has deftly twisted contacts with the West into a new form of social control, more humane than labor camps but equally effective. The coveted trip to Western Europe or to the United States, and the access to American records and films, are now rewards for good behavior at home, and the denial of the privileges can be a devastating punishment that keeps people in line.

The results are sometimes bizarre. A student at Moscow University began to avoid American exchange students after she learned that she had a chance to study in the United States the following year; she did not want to risk losing her trip by seeming pro-American. A surgeon was denied trips abroad for years after having once complained mildly to a reporter in New York about shortages of Soviet medicines and equipment.

#### JOIN THE PARTY AND TRAVEL ABROAD

A young Estonian was told that he could not travel to Britain unless he joined the party, so he did. A young Muscovite was refused party membership because years before he had befriended an American boy studying at his high school.

But knowing an American also has advantages, for the most ordinary props of American life have become valuable currency in the Soviet Union. A pack of Winstons or Marlboros moves the most officious bureaucrat. Packages of chewing gum are often used by relatives of imprisoned dissidents to bribe labor-camp officials into extending visiting times.

An American diplomat once offered a copy of Playboy magazine, outlawed in the Soviet Union as pornography, to a policeman guarding the American's apartment house. The officer accepted it with delight. Later, the American was spotted by another officer who had just come on duty and was asked whether he had another copy. The diplomat said no.

"Well," said the policeman, "do you have a gin and tonic?" The American got him one.

#### WALL CALENDARS ARE HELD PRECIOUS

Détente has even introduced a new ritual into some Russians' preparations for New Year's Day, their most festive holiday. Those with access to Westerners begin maneuvering weeks in advance to get their hands on wall calendars emblazoned with the names of American or European companies.

Swissair calendars are routinely stolen from the airline's office at Moscow's Sheremetyevo Airport. Pan American calendars are used in complex schemes of favoritism and bribery that only a bazaar merchant could unravel. One linguist gave a Pan Am calendar this year as a "thank you" to his wife's boss, who had used his influence to get the linguist's daughter transferred to a better kindergarten by promising the factory that ran the kindergarten some unspecified favor.

Shortly before last New Year's Day, David L. Buckman, the former Moscow representative of Chase Manhattan Bank, was talking on his office intercom with his secretary about a shipment of bank calendars. Moments later, the secretary asked him to step into the corridor, where she explained that the man who monitors conversations had

asked whether he might have a few of the precious calendars.

Travel is the great prize, however. Only 8,750 Russians visited the United States last year, according to the State Department, and only 3,500 of them were tourists. By contrast, 100,000 Americans came to the Soviet Union, all tourists except 5,000 to 6,000 on exchanges or on government or private business.

Many dancers, musicians, actors and writers feel trips to the West are vital to their art, keeping them in touch with creative developments in the outside world. But those selected to make tours are chosen as much on the basis of political reliability and personal favoritism as for their talents.

A violinist with the Bolshoi Opera and Ballet, for instance, scrupulously attends political lectures twice a month and will take an examination in political subjects, not because she is interested—she knits through the droning sessions—but because she wants to make a tour to the West and needs a near-perfect attendance record to be selected. She will have to leave her musician-husband behind as insurance that she will return.

#### NECESSITIES ARE BOUGHT ABROAD

Some musicians say frankly that they go abroad less for the culture than for the chance to buy things. Of the \$19 to \$25 each receives daily in the United States to pay for lunch and dinner, they save enough by virtually starving themselves and living off cans of fish and hunks of cheese carried from Moscow to stock up on hard-to-get items such as violin strings, clarinet reeds and mouthpieces, as well as clothes, records and hi-fi equipment if they can afford it.

Back home, they parcel these out to friends, relatives or influential officials, or they can sell them on the black market for enormous profits.

The affluence in American life undoubtedly makes the most dramatic impression on Russians who see the United States first hand and who come from a society of long lines, a scarce meat, shoddy goods—a life of constant struggle to live well, and one of little luxury.

A Russian woman visiting the New York area several years ago maintained a stoic "ours is better" attitude through a tour of Lincoln Center, the Empire State Building and a cruise around Manhattan, until her hostess took her into a supermarket. There, the veneer of smugness cracked as the Russian woman stood amid seemingly endless aisles of fresh vegetables, red meat and frozen foods—and wept.

#### SOME FIND FREEDOM ATTRACTIVE

Those who find American freedom attractive are mostly intellectuals and artistic performers, a tiny elite whose political impact at home is minimal, especially since the party assiduously weighs its upper ranks with unintellectual, industry-oriented technicians.

For many in the cultural world, the exposure to creativity unfettered by governmental edict is a heady and painfully exhilarating experience that feeds frustration.

In his book "To Dance," the ballet star Valery Panov writes that what drove him to fight for emigration, a battle finally won, was the bureaucrats' unexplained decision to deprive him of foreign travel and to curb his attempts to push beyond the accepted norms of dance on stage.

Mikhail Baryshnikov, who defected, once said: "If I had the opportunity to leave Russia for one month, two months at a time, to work with different choreographers and return home to the Kirov, I would never have left. My homeland, my theater, my friends mean more to me than anything. But the time came for a choice: my art or my peaceful contentment."

It is probably in culture that the strongest Western influence has been felt, and even

that has been slow and muffled, a reluctant penetration by abstract painting, theatrical symbolism, rock and jazz, modern dance, truthful literature—a gradual erosion of the heroically optimistic socialist realism of Stalin's time, which nonetheless remains the most acceptable form, and the safest.

Overall, American life looks chaotic, insecure, crime-ridden and frighteningly disorderly to ordinary Russians whose perceptions are dimmed by a veil of Marxist upbringing and official propaganda. The multiplicity of American voices is confusing and disturbing to a society hungry for strong leadership and eager for a single comprehensive political truth.

A Soviet historian recently made a telling remark after having heard a West Coast professor describe American politics. "That's very undisciplined," the historian said. Then, asked to describe his own image of America, he declared: "You don't have an idea. Russians have an idea. Russians need an idea to believe in." This highly educated man did not understand that the essence of the American idea is in the din of ideas.

Many Russians tend to project their own political experience onto American society. Their Constitution's high-sounding provisions on freedom of speech mean nothing, so they assume that the American Constitution's guarantees mean nothing. Their elections are charades, so they assume that American elections are charades. Sharp criticism here is considered disloyal, so they assume the same is true in the United States.

The real injustices that exist in the United States also inspire Soviet distaste for American society and translate easily into a lack of regard for the American political system. Problems of poverty, unemployment, crime, racial discrimination and violations of human rights by the police and the Central Intelligence Agency are reported and often magnified by Soviet television and newspapers.

"The United States is rapidly turning into a society of total espionage where the state would permanently spy on all citizens," the Government's press agency, Tass, reported from New York recently.

Americans who said in a Harris Poll that they were concerned about government invasion of privacy were justified, Tass said. "For decades, Washington has been collecting information about the private lives of Americans by means of a ramified network of informers, a bugging system, shadowing and reading mail."

#### ÉMIGRÉS FEAR BLACKS IN NEW YORK

Many Russians have learned to disbelieve such propaganda, or at least to put it through corrective lenses before arriving at what they think is an accurate view. They seem to do the same with the Voice of America, whose broadcasts are so widely heard now that hardly anyone tries to hide the fact that he listens. Even party members routinely cite the transmissions in conversation.

But the United States still bears negative images, and some of them derive from Russians' racism. The number of black Americans make the United States unattractive in the Soviet mind, which tends to link blacks with crime. And émigrés heading for New York sometimes worry what the city is like with so many blacks.

So the stereotypes are confirmed: material excellence, dangerous streets, hostile blacks, terrifying disorder—a profound ambivalence about America.

"You cannot understand us," a staff member of the party's Central Committee declared not long ago, "because you have not suffered and survived what we have. You have not been under the Tatar yoke, you have not lived under a Stalin—and God keep you from ever having to. You are from a different

world. You are like Martians to us. And I suppose we are like Martians to you." ●

#### NKOMO ONLY RHODESIAN WHEN SHOOTING AT CIVILIANS AND CIVILIAN PLANES

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago I called for a Federal investigation of Atlanta Mayor Maynard Jackson as a result of his \$4,000 gift to visiting Rhodesian terrorist Joshua Nkomo. At that time I asked Secretary Blumenthal to clarify his Department's position on what appeared to be a direct violation of Federal law.

Section 530.101(a)(4) of the Treasury Department's Rhodesian Sanctions Regulations reads as follows:

Other transfers of property to or on behalf of or for the benefit of any person in Southern Rhodesia (including the authorities thereof) . . . are prohibited.

Today, I received a response signed by Gene E. Godley, Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Treasury. I was not surprised that the Department found no violation but I was dumbfounded when I learned the reasons. Mr. Godley initially tells me that such a transfer is not illegal under the statutes providing the transferee is not acting for or on behalf of or for the benefit of any person in Southern Rhodesia. That strikes me as amusing since our own Ambassador to the United Nations, Andy Young and emissaries from the Department of State made it a point to meet with Nkomo during his visit to the United States. In other words, the Treasury Department is telling me that Nkomo represents no one in Southern Rhodesia but the State Department says he does.

In the next paragraph, Mr. Godley writes that—

It is generally understood that Joshua Nkomo is not currently a resident of, nor a person within, Southern Rhodesia.

Furthermore, the Assistant Secretary adds:

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, it would appear that the transfer in question did not contravene the Rhodesian Sanctions Regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I could hardly believe my eyes when I read this nonsense. Apparently, Joshua Nkomo is only a resident of Rhodesia when he is visiting there for the purpose of blasting civilian airliners out of the sky and murdering hundreds of innocent people in cold blood.

It is the same old double standard. These are not my sanctions. They are the sanctions supported by the Maynard Jacksons, the Andy Youngs and the Jimmy Carters of this world, yet the law is violated, they can respond with an inane justification for doing so. If you or I would seek to conduct an honest business transaction with anyone residing in Rhodesia, we would be in violation of Federal law. When Maynard

Jackson presents a gift of \$4,000 to a self-proclaimed Rhodesian murderer, a man who has repeatedly said that violence is the only answer, then the Carter administration sweeps it under the rug. More than that they bow and scrape to curry favor with this madman while snubbing a decent leader, Bishop Muzorewa.

I do not intend to drop my call for an investigation and will advise the Attorney General of that intention. This nonsense has gone on long enough. I have been advised that later this week, the House of Representatives will have the opportunity to go on record as either for or against the continuation of the Rhodesian sanctions. I hope that my colleagues will join me in ending the liberal double-standard.

The State Department letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,

Washington, D.C., June 13, 1979.

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASHBROOK: Your letter of May 30, 1979 inquires about a gift of \$4,000 to Joshua Nkomo.

Section 530.101(a)(4) of the Treasury Department's Rhodesian Sanctions Regulations prohibits unlicensed transfers of property to or on behalf of or for the benefit of any person in Southern Rhodesia (including the authorities thereof).

This section would prohibit a transfer of funds to any person in Southern Rhodesia. On the other hand, it does not prohibit any transfer to a Rhodesian in the United States or elsewhere outside Southern Rhodesia, provided the transferee is not acting for or on behalf of or for the benefit of any person in Southern Rhodesia.

It is generally understood that Joshua Nkomo is not currently a resident of, nor a person within, Southern Rhodesia. Accordingly, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, it would appear that the transfer in question did not contravene the Rhodesian Sanctions Regulations.

Sincerely,

GENE E. GODLEY,  
Assistant Secretary (Legislative affairs.) ●

#### IRRELEVANT WEEK

### HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1979

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, sometimes in life being last can turn out to be first. And so it is in Newport Beach, Calif., where next week the traditional annual "Irrelevant Week" ceremonies will take place, honoring, after a fashion, the last draft pick of the National Football League, one Mike Almond of Northwestern Louisiana University of Natchitoches, La.

Mike Almond was the 334th man chosen in the 1979 draft, picked by the world champions of Super Bowl XIII, the Pittsburgh Steelers. Mike, who is a wide receiver, will be on the receiving end of weeklong honors, banquets, toasts, roasts, a tour of Disneyland, a day at the races and a weekend in Las Vegas.

While the top draft choices of the various NFL teams are busy at home engaged in the drudgery of counting their money, Mike Almond will be out in California,



in the 40th District, which I represent, having fun. Presumably.

If Almond is to count any money, it is unlikely it will be Pittsburgh Steelers funds. Hollywood Park maybe. Las Vegas maybe. But at least he will get bus fare home to Natchitoches.

Mike Almond follows in the footsteps of three undistinguished football players who were drafted last in the NFL's annual exercise in gridiron betterment, all of whom failed to better the game. They came from such well-known football powerhouses as the University of Dayton, Colorado University, and Montana State.

Thus far, none of the Irrelevant Week honorees have made it to a National Football League game, either regular or preseason. In fact, a few days of training camp is the best we have seen.

But as we approach another Irrelevant Week in Newport Beach, I would like to call the attention of the Members of this honorable body to the achievements and the promise carried in the person of Mike Almond that this dismal string of failures will be broken at last.

It may mean the end of Irrelevant Week, of course, if Almond survives the cut by the Pittsburgh Steelers. But that is a chance we all will have to take.

As a wide receiver at Northwestern Louisiana University, Mike has caught 95 passes in 42 games for 1,562 yards and 10 touchdowns. This has placed him as the alltime leading receiver at the institute of higher learning, no mean accomplishment when one considers the rather mediocre record the football teams have amassed.

Being drafted by the Pittsburgh Steelers, the No. 1 professional football team in the United States, has both its good points and its bad points.

On the plus side, of course, is the distinction and honor of being selected by the best. On the negative side, Mike Almond certainly is scratching his head trying to figure how to survive the cut and make the squad.

Bravely, he has commented that the world champions have terrific talent, particularly among the wide receivers, such as Lynn Swann and John Stallworth.

"Maybe I'll learn something from them," Mike said in a candid moment.

No doubt he will. With any luck at all he will learn patience. And how to see Swann and Stallworth catching passes in the end zone from his position on the bench.

However it works out, we all should be proud of the Mike Almonds of the world. For despite what one might hear about Irrelevant Week, being drafted last is a victory, of sorts. After all, only one person can be first and one person can be last each year and nothing we say or do can change that.●

#### TRIBUTE TO LEONARD HALL

**HON. JOHN W. WYDLER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay

tribute to the passing of one of Long Island's, New York's, and the United States' great American political and governmental leaders.

Leonard W. Hall, who rose from the humble beginning of son of a coachman for President Theodore Roosevelt to a Member of this august body—1939–53—carried a philosophy that "the whole basis of politics is that it should be fun. If it is not fun, I want no part of it."

Leonard Hall served his country as an elected official; as a Member of the House of Representatives, a member of the New York State Assembly, and as Nassau County surrogate and sheriff.

Leonard Hall was a pillar of his political party serving as Republican National Chairman and as advisor to many past and present political and national leaders.

Many people who reach national prominence forget their roots. Leonard Hall, throughout his lifetime, worked for the interest of Long Island and had only the highest ideals for the many that he advised, as his party's standard bearers.

Long Island, New York, and the Nation have suffered a great loss with the passing of this honorable and decent American, and I wish to publicly pay tribute to this great American and a man I called my friend.

May I also express my condolences to his wife Gladys and the rest of the Hall family in their days of bereavement.●

#### WEST VIRGINIA'S CREATION 116 YEARS AGO TODAY STEEPED IN HISTORICAL CONTROVERSY—A STATE ON THRESHOLD OF NEW CHALLENGES

**HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, 116 years ago, President Abraham Lincoln signed the proclamation which created the 35th State of the Union. On this anniversary, we invite Senators and citizens generally to recall with us this significant birth date of West Virginia.

Much that has been written of the Mountain State, a wonderful land and good people, in recent years has served to obscure the richness and diversity of its human and natural resources. We read of disasters and economic upheavals. Today, however, West Virginia stands on the threshold of new challenges; within its rugged hills run the rich veins of coal which can and must provide new energy sources over the critical years ahead.

Historically, the new State of West Virginia created a puzzle for many historians. It was not always clear whether or not the western region of Virginia seceded from Virginia and the Confederate States, to join the Union, or, as some writers have implied, the Commonwealth shed itself of its western neighbors to clear the political path to form a separate nation. Both Virginians

and West Virginians were divided on the issues of the Civil War.

Author-historian Julian G. Hearne, Jr., a retired Army general, has taken many historians' views into account in recreating the events of 1863. In a comprehensive article appearing in the current issue of the unique and excellent weekly newspaper, the West Virginia Hillbilly, Hearne attempts to resolve the apparent conflicting viewpoints and provide a balanced account of the historic separation of the sister States.

I submit the article for the RECORD for the guidance and enlightenment of my colleagues.

The article follows:

WEST VIRGINIA

(By Col. Julian G. Hearne, Jr., U.S. Army, retired)

The 20th being West Virginia statehood day, it is appropriate to review the situation and events of 1861 which culminated in the birth of the thirty-fifth state on 20 June, 1863; and we are indeed fortunate in having books written by authors whose sources of information were unimpeachable and which present full and trustworthy accounts of these events and surrounding circumstances. Foremost among such writers were two residents of Morgantown—William P. Willey, Esquire, Professor of Law at W.V.U., whose book "An Inside View of the Formation of the State of West Virginia" was published in 1901, and The Honorable John Marshall Hagans, whose account is set out as the preface to Volume I of "Hagans' Reports of Cases in the West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals," published in 1866. Professor Willey was the son of Hon. Waitman T. Willey, a United States Senator from Virginia who became one of the first two West Virginia senators; and Senator Willey had also been a delegate to the Richmond (secession) convention of 1861, as well as to the Wheeling conventions in May and June of that year. Author Hagans, in addition to having been the first official reporter of our state's highest court, held many other public offices, including mayor of Morgantown, prosecuting attorney and circuit court judge of Monongalia County, a delegate to the state legislature, and a Congressman as well. There can be no doubt as to the integrity of these gentlemen, or the accuracy of their sources of information, and it is a safe bet that they told it as it was—or should I follow the present-day trend toward illiteracy and say "tell it like it was?"

In summarizing the circumstances and events as related by authors Willey and Hagans I can mention only some of the more significant highspots, due to space limitations allotted therefor.

Pursuant to an act of the general assembly which had convened in special session in January, a convention met in Richmond on 13 February, 1861. Now this convention was unprecedented in the History of Virginia, in that it had been called without first submitting to popular vote the question as to whether or not the people desired a convention with authority to deal with the organic law of the commonwealth; and if Virginia were to remain in the Union, no such convention would have been necessary. "The secession schemers in the legislature," said Willey, "were far-sighted and adroit, and not very scrupulous about the forms of law or precedent when this stood in the way of their ultimate purpose. . . . They refused to risk a vote by the people [and provided] for a convention to be held less than a month ahead," leaving but little time for the people to determine their position and decide upon the character of the men who should represent them.

When the convention convened, a substantial majority of the members were pro-

Union; but on 18 March they heard addresses by "commissioners" from South Carolina, Georgia and Mississippi and—according to Prof. Willey—"before the convention was aware of it the State of Virginia had been virtually carried out of the Union and linked to the Southern Confederacy;" and thereupon "the rabble, the violent, the mob elements of the population of Richmond came to the front and began to take a hand, so to speak, in the proceedings of the convention." When the bombardment of Fort Sumter began on 12 April the Stars and Stripes were torn from the capitol flagstaff and the Confederate flag was flown thereafter.

The convention went into—and continued in—secret session on 16 April, with all personnel sworn to secrecy, and on the following day the so-called "ordinance of secession" was adopted. It was to take effect when ratified by majority vote on the fourth Thursday of May (being the 23rd), which gave a color of compliance with the principle that the people should have an opportunity to pass upon the work of the convention. Notwithstanding this provision, however, and without knowledge of the people of Virginia, the convention proceeded to take these actions, among others: (1) Passed an ordinance whereby the whole military force of the commonwealth was placed under the chief control and direction of the president of the Confederacy; (2) Ratified and formally adopted the Constitution of the "Provisional Government of the Confederate States of America;" (3) Released all public officers from their oath, as required by state law, of obligation to the United States; and (4) Resolved that all delegates to the convention from western Virginia who had voted against secession be expelled from the convention. All of these actions constituted a clear assumption of sovereign power prior to ratification by the people, and Virginia had thereby become, in effect, part of a foreign and hostile government bordering upon the boundary line of the United States! Nor did the Confederacy await Virginia's election of the Fourth Thursday of May to send "foreign" troops from the Southern states into the Old Dominion to become part of the incipient Army of Northern Virginia!

Following adoption of the "ordinance of secession" the Union delegates, unable to exert any influence whatever, went to their homes, some of them having been made fearful for their personal safety. There followed, then, mass meetings in many communities within western Virginia, terminating with a more formal assembly which took place in Wheeling in early May. This assembly accomplished nothing more than providing for a convention of constitutional nature to be held in Wheeling on the 11th of June, which would be after the fourth Thursday in May regular election, and all members of the general assembly (legislature) of Virginia then elected, who would take oath to support the Union, were to be delegates, along with others to be chosen from each county. (As it turned out, several men appeared as delegates from Fairfax and Alexandria counties, across the Potomac from the nation's capitol in Washington!)

Some of those who met in Wheeling that 11th day of June were advocates of immediate action to form a new state; but the accelerating disintegration of civil government in western Virginia with the resignation of numerous public officers, while bands of armed men roamed the highways supposedly to drive out secessionists but more often to commit looting and depredations, together with memories of the very recent skirmish at Philippi, soon convinced them that the first and primary duty of the convention was to restore the government of Virginia to the Union and to keep it there throughout the duration of the war. Accordingly, the convention proceeded to (1) declare the "Ordinance of Secession" null and void (2) declare that Governor Letcher and all other public officers who adhered to the Confederacy had thereby vacated their offices; (3) Provide for the filling of vacancies thereby created; (4) require an oath of loyalty from all public officers to support both the Constitution of the United States and the "Restored Government of Virginia;" (5) elect a governor, lieutenant governor, attorney general and a governor's council; (6) call a special session of the general assembly to meet in Wheeling on 1 July; (7) pass several miscellaneous ordinances and resolutions; and (8) adjourn on 20 June until the first Tuesday in August. Then, when the general assembly convened on 1 July, that body elected two United States Senators to fill the vacancies of those who had joined with the Confederacy and also elected those state officers who were by law to be so elected. It is also important to note that Governor Pierpont informed the assembly that he had notified President Lincoln of the new government and the President had recognized Mr. Pierpont as "Governor of Virginia;" and soon thereafter the Senate seated Virginia's new senators and the House of Representatives seated in due course those congressmen who had been elected from districts of Virginia west of the Mountains. The President had also promised "all constitutional aid" to this newly organized government of Virginia.

On the first Tuesday in August the convention reconvened in Wheeling, and proceeded to take all further action necessary to bring the new proposed state in readiness for admission to the Union; and the general assembly by an Act of 13 May, 1862, gave the consent of Virginia to the creation of a New Dominion from the Old, so that the requirements of the United States Constitution would be fulfilled. Thereafter, when Congress had given the final consent by an Act approved 31 December, 1862, the President proclaimed on 20 April 1863 that West Virginia would become a state of the Union from and after sixty days of that date, which was taken to mean 20 June, 1863!

Author Hagans points out that no change in the constitution or laws of Virginia were made; that the whole proceedings of the convention in June were simply a change of managers rather than a change of government. He then goes on to uphold the validity of all those acts of the convention and general assembly on the basis that "no government existed in Virginia recognized by the Constitution of the United States; therefore it was the duty of the people to erect one. It was an absolute duty not confined alone to the impositions of responsibility resting on civilized men, but impelled by the discharge of a high patriotic trust, in the interest of constitutional government." Both Hagans and Willey observe that the stamp of constitutionality is given by the recognition of the Restored Government by both houses of Congress and by President Lincoln.

In view of the indisputable facts and the unanimity of judgment presented by the learned, distinguished, authors hereinbefore cited, it is interesting to note some allegations of "fact" and some dissenting opinions of a present-day W.V.U. professor of history, John Alexander Williams, as set forth in his book entitled "West Virginia: A Bicentennial History," which was published in 1976 and promptly cited for that year's "literary merit award" of the West Virginia Library Association. Although classified as a history book by the National Endowment for the Humanities (through whose grant you and I and other taxpayers helped defray at least a portion of the costs of publication), I perceive sufficient fiction therein to earn an award in that field also—a double-barrel award, so to speak, and possibly the first of its kind the Association ever made. I shall now cite some examples.

Author Williams blandly states that when

the Richmond convention "voted its secession ordinance in April, 1861, several [emphasis mine] of the northwestern unionists . . . reassembled . . . a few days later [in Clarksburg] to denounce the secessionists and to call for a division of the state;" but he makes no mention of the expulsion of all the western delegates whose only crime was to vote the will of their constituents, nor does he cite the threats which had been made to their safety by their further presence; and I am inclined to suspect that the good professor was either unaware of the writings of authors Willey and Hagans, or else let his imagination take over in favor of some preconceived opinion of his own; for he correctly states that the secession ordinance, enacted on 17 April, "required ratification of the voters" at an election not due to be held until 23 May. He mildly acknowledges, however, that just as soon as this ordinance was adopted, "both unionists and secessionists began acting as though the issue were settled." So far, so good, but now hear this: "Authorities at Richmond called the militia to state service and co-operated [a nice word, that, equivalent to "detente," perhaps] with the local secessionists in seizing control" of various military stores and arsenals owned by Uncle Sam, while he (unwittingly?) admits that all the unionists did was to hold mass meetings and drill troops, while the Lincoln Administration "held in check Federal forces then gathering along Virginia's borders!"

Professor Williams opines that "the state makers" were forced by circumstances to adopt the procedures they followed, i.e., to erect the restored government of Virginia, which about a year later gave Virginia's consent to the new state carved from her territory; and he characterizes their actions as "subterfuge," (in that the "real" Virginia never gave any such consent). But as authors Willey and Hagans point out Western Virginia was lacking an effective government, and the erection of a state government under the federal constitution was both essential and urgent, not merely to create a new state, but to restore law and order as well as to enable what remained of old Virginia to call upon the President of the United States for federal troops to expel from (western) Virginia soil an invasion by—in point of fact—not mere Virginia militia, but components of the armed forces of a foreign power, furnished to it by a de facto regime which called itself the government of Virginia, and placed under the overall command of the "president" of the so-called Confederate States of America, which was not recognized by the United States or by any other country in the world.

The state makers' procedure is made more clear in a book by another W.V.U. professor, Charles H. Ambler, in the appendix of his monumental biography of Governor Pierpont, published in 1937, wherein a speech by Pierpont to the June, 1861 Wheeling convention, prescribes the actions he recommends to be taken; and when this speech is compared with the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case from Rhode Island, *Luther v. Borden* (1849, 17 Howard 1), it is seen that Pierpont's recommended procedure is verbatim that of the Court as a guide to be followed so as to comply with constitutional requirements. Still another W.V.U. faculty member, visiting professor George E. Moore, in his book "A Banner in the Hills," published in 1963, cites *Luther v. Borden* as ample authority for the actions of our "state makers." Now I like to believe that Professor Williams was unaware of *Luther v. Borden* when he wrote his bicentennial "history" book, for it would dishonor him to imply that he would deny to our "state makers" the justification of that decision when he charges that they "resorted to legal pretenses that served



them well enough at the time but which, after the emergency passed and the state-making process was examined at leisure, could be made to seem expedient, unprincipled, cheap." Well, I suppose the good professor might be right, if he were to present this viewpoint to a class of students who likewise had failed to do their homework. On the other hand, all W.V.U. professors whose work on this subject I have read, are in full accord that Daniel Webster was correct when he forecast—as stated by Professor Willey—that if the South ever withdrew from the Union, the separation would leave Virginia dismembered, for the natural line of the division would leave Western Virginia allied with the states of the North rather than the South. What Mr. Webster saw as a natural and inevitable result of an divided nation, was one of the very first results of an attempt to divide."

Professor Williams' book alleges that the Virginia general assembly during its 1865-66 session in Richmond "repealed all of the sanctioning legislation upon which West Virginia statehood was based," and that assertion is simply drawn from thin air—there is no such legislation enacted at that or any other session. Author Williams then alleges that this action constituted a "needle under West Virginia's collective skin" and that such needle has been there "ever since." My hat is off to author Williams, the novelist, for his powerful imagination; it is easy to understand and to applaud the award given his book by the Library Association.

Any moral one may purport to discover herein is unintentional. In conclusion, however, it is interesting to note how one W.V.U. professor-author raps the views of his peers—some of whom were eye witnesses. Although author Williams dilutes a number of material and proven facts and adds some entertaining fiction of his own, his book deals with a basis situation wherein an enemy equivalent to a hostile power holds New Orleans and denies control of the Mississippi to the United States. Hostilities have begun, and western Virginia becomes pitted in combat with the rest of Virginia and the South, as Daniel Webster had predicted some thirty years before: (and as Brevet Colonel Theodore F. Lang recounts in his "Loyal West Virginians From 1861 to 1865" published in 1895, which book is cited by the author Williams as authority for some other unfounded point). Now then, the "state makers," as Williams calls them, take the opportunity afforded by the occasion to follow a course of action previously sanctioned by the Supreme Court of the United States to bring about a permanent separation of western Virginia from old Virginia, and this procedure on their part he castigates as "subterfuge," and which, after the war and examined at one's leisure could be made to seem "expedient, unprincipled, cheap."

On the other hand, in a book entitled "Triumphs of American Diplomacy," published in 1906 (some seventy-one years ago, still another author deals with a somewhat similar situation of late 1802 and early 1803, wherein Spain held New Orleans and her local governor revoked a right theretofore granted to American raftsmen to deposit their cargoes there, duty free, while awaiting shipment overseas. Though of great interest, the details of the story are immaterial here; it suffices to relate that President Jefferson, although convinced that any possessor of New Orleans was "a natural enemy" of the United States, nevertheless believed that he had no authority under the Constitution to negotiate for the purchase of The Louisiana Territory; but that is exactly what he proceeded to do! Treading upon a diplomatic

tight-rope all the way, he seized upon every favorable opportunity to promote his plan, every "expedient" occasion, under circumstances fraught with danger of war; and he successfully accomplished his mission, was sustained by the Congress, and applauded by the American people! Now here is the assessment of President Jefferson's actions and his stature as a statesman by that author, Dr. Edwin Maxey, who was—guess what!—Professor of International Law at W.V.U.! . . . "Whatever we may think of Jefferson's political ideas, his action was statesmanlike and diplomatic in the highest degree . . ." and on another page Professor Maxey goes on to say "Jefferson had theories—plenty of them—but they were not his sole guide. He had the good sense to discern when a condition and not a theory confronted him. When there was necessity for action, he did not suffer himself to be hampered by theory but acted in accordance with what seemed wise under all circumstances of the case.—In other words he squared his political actions by the rule of expediency. There is the difference between a statesman and a philosopher—the former recognizes the fact that the welfare of the people is the supreme law." ●

#### TRIBUTE TO LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1979

● Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of respect and admiration that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late former Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Leverett Saltonstall, on the occasion of his passing.

The Boston Globe called Leverett Saltonstall, "The Grand Old Man of Massachusetts." The New York Times pointed out that this distinguished son of the Commonwealth was the man whom columnists said had "Back Bay manners and a South Boston face." Former Speaker John McCormack, whose public service closely paralleled Senator Saltonstall's, called him a "great friend, an outstanding American and a gentleman." His friends, constituents and Republican colleagues fondly called him "Salty."

Leverett Saltonstall was a "Proper Bostonian," a Massachusetts patrician, and a real patriotic American. He was one of the most honorable people in the history of this country to have served in public office. No son or daughter of Massachusetts was more beloved and revered than Leverett Saltonstall.

Leverett Saltonstall had a long and distinguished public career. To him, public office was a public trust. For nearly three generations, he served the Commonwealth of Massachusetts: First, as district attorney for Middlesex County; then, as a member of the State legislature, where he served as its speaker from 1929 until 1936; later, as Governor of Massachusetts; and finally, as a Mem-

ber of the U.S. Senate where he served the State of Massachusetts for over 22 years.

A man of great personal courage, strong moral character, and personal conviction, and possessing an innate sense of honor, decency, and integrity, Leverett Saltonstall represented the highest ideals of public life. He was equally respected and appreciated by Democrats and Republicans alike. To those of us who served on the other side of the aisle in the State legislature when he was Governor and in the U.S. House of Representatives when he was U.S. Senator, Leverett Saltonstall was an astute politician who was completely dedicated to the citizens of Massachusetts and to the best interests and welfare of the Commonwealth. He was one of the most decent human beings I have ever known.

"Salty" loved people, and the people of Massachusetts loved "Salty." He represented the finest that Massachusetts could give to our Nation. The Commonwealth has lost one of its most outstanding citizens. My wife, Millie, joins me in extending our sincere condolences to Alice Saltonstall and to the entire Saltonstall family. ●

#### PLIGHT OF CZECHOSLOVAKIAN CITIZENS

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

In January 1977 a group of more than 200 persons led by professionals in Czechoslovakia formed a committee to monitor human rights in that country based on the Helsinki Accords of 1975, agreed to by Czechoslovakia and 34 other nations.

Recently the Charter 77 Committee published a new document which was critical of the Government's economic policies as compared with policies in Western European countries.

Subsequently, beginning in late May, members of the Charter 77 movement have been arrested and charged with spreading false information at home and abroad with the aim of creating a loss of public confidence in the country's system. It is believed that the charges of subversion can mean 1- to 10-year jail sentences for those arrested.

News of the charges came from one of the few remaining Charter 77 spokespersons at liberty, Mrs. Zdena Tominova.

On June 7 news reached the free world that Mrs. Tominova had been accosted and beaten by masked men as she entered her home and that she was taken to a Prague hospital with a brain concussion.

In the United States there have been published articles too numerous to count

critical of our Government's economic policies. None of the authors have been arrested and charged with subversion. No one has been attacked and beaten.

The contrast between a free country and a totalitarian state is at once dramatic and terribly sad.

The plight of the citizens of Czechoslovakia, whose heritage is independence and freedom, has been brought to my attention by the Czechoslovak National Council of America, a nonprofit organization founded in 1918 and devoted to the preservation of democratic freedom.●

#### SOLAR POWER: IMPORTANT FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

**HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to join President Carter and several of my distinguished colleagues today for a White House meeting to announce the administration's support of a major Federal program to spur development of solar power.

The plan, which has a multimillion dollar Solar Development Bank as its center piece, is designed to bring solar power production up to 20 percent of America's energy needs by the year 2000.

The Solar Development Bank, which may be funded with as much as \$100 million, would work with private financial institutions to provide financing for private solar power projects. In some cases the loans would be subsidized so that their interest rates would be lower than normal market rates; in other cases the loans would be guaranteed against default by the Government.

This important and far-reaching proposal is a necessary step if the United States is to free itself of its dependence on oil. The United States currently draws only about 6 percent of its energy supply from solar power; an increase to 20 percent by 2000 would be a great boost to our economy and our national security.

For the individual homeowner, the Solar Development Bank would mean easier access to financing for home solar heating units. The Solar Development Bank would work with financial institutions to provide low-interest, long-term loans to owners or builders of commercial or residential buildings who wish to purchase and install solar energy systems.

One of the most important aspects of the proposal is its flexible definition of solar power. The proposal would allow subsidized loans to be made not only for traditional rooftop sunlight collectors, but also for such energy producing systems as gasohol, wood-burning devices, wind-propelled energy producers, and water systems.

This flexible approach insures that many people who want to do their part

in a national energy conservation effort will not be deprived of assistance from a Solar Development Bank.

This proposal compliments recent actions taken by the House Banking Committee in the field of synthetic fuels. The Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization and the committee as a whole have both enthusiastically endorsed an extension of the Defense Production Act of 1950, which will spur development of alternative energy resources. This bill would insure production of at least 2 million barrels of synthetic fuels a day by 1985, thereby significantly reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

Together, these two proposals indicate that alternative energy sources can be developed, and that Government assistance will be a necessary foundation on which increased energy self-reliance will be built.●

#### YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

**HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, with summer upon us we are further reminded of the critical issue of youth unemployment. I would like to contribute my thoughts on this subject in order that a dialog be continued until a solution is found.

It is my hope that the 96th Congress will take up and pass an amendment to provide for a subminimum wage for youth workers and for full-time students.

The alarming rate of youth unemployment which has continued to grow despite massive Government jobs programs, is a statement in itself. Obviously the answer lies within the private sector and not in Government-provided jobs.

The impact of unemployment especially upon youngsters confined to an urban area, is not only economic and social but psychological as well. Studies such as the one by the Joint Economic Committee of the 95th Congress, show that the minimum wage does contribute to youth unemployment. If the minimum wage, which is currently \$2.90, impedes employment, then a lower minimum wage should constitute something less substantial in the way of an impediment and for those seeking work under a youth/student subminimum, a positive competitive advantage.

It is difficult for youth workers and for students to enter the labor market for the first time. Employers feel that the lack of experience, discipline, specific industrial training and their reliability makes them less attractive and less valuable employees. To make them more competitive with older, more experienced workers, one should allow them the advantage of lower costs to the employer.

If an employer can be reimbursed for his training and risk through a wage

reduction then it would be a mutually profitable experience.

Another beneficiary to this arrangement would be society itself. If there is less unemployment, more satisfactory job opportunities amongst the youth, there would more than likely be less juvenile crime, less addiction to drugs amongst the teenagers, since much crime and drug addiction has been traced to boredom and frustration and alienation amongst the youth, especially in urban areas.

Of course, the more experienced and trained of the youth would not have to accept subminimal wages. It merely allows employers as well as employees an opportunity to employ and be employed at a lower rate, until they are trained.●

TRIBUTE TO REV. DR. KARL  
EUGENE KNISELEY

**HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. MOORHEAD of California. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Dr. Karl Eugene Kniseley of Glendale, is retiring after 38 years of devoted service to the United Lutheran Church of America.

But as a long-time friend of Dr. Kniseley, I believe this is just a formality. I am certain he will not retire from this service to the Lord and to mankind. That he cannot do because for too long, his life and labors have been dedicated to the betterment and enrichment of his fellow man to simply stop his dedication.

For too long now, he has nurtured and strengthened the spiritual underpinnings of those within his wide sphere of influence to simply relinquish his ministrations.

He has espoused and practiced "tis better to give than receive" for far too many years now to simply cease his giving. For many decades, the central theme of his life has been the desire to serve his God, his country and his parishioners. He cannot now simply replace this love of service with some less altruistic creed.

There is reason for gladness in the knowledge that these worthy features of Dr. Kniseley's life will remain extant. They are far too much a part of his physical and spiritual being to be dislodged or extinguished by the mere suspension of official duties and pastoral obligations.

As Dr. Kniseley steps down from the pulpit of the First Lutheran Church of Glendale, and opportunity is provided for those of us who have known and been served by this faithful man to recognize and pay tribute—small as it is—to his devotion, his steadfastness, his endearing amiability and his graciousness of spirit.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Kniseley is a man



who has made a difference on the side of goodness and charity in this seemingly indifferent world.●

#### FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA

### HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, this month we are observing a tragic anniversary in the history of the Lithuanian people. On June 15, 1940, in complete violation of a solemn juridical obligation to respect the sovereignty of Lithuania, the Soviet Union forcibly invaded that country. To terrorize the inhabitants of Lithuania into submission, Moscow commenced arresting leading citizens. Lithuania thus became a victim of Soviet colonialism and a reign of terror was introduced. Beginning July 13, 1940, thousands of Lithuanians were arrested.

To break the people's resistance even further, the Soviet Union, on June 14-15, 1941, executed mass arrests and deported thousands of Lithuanian citizens to Russian slave labor camps.

In the 39 years since the beginning of this reign of oppression, Lithuanians have shown a fierce determination to preserve their own culture, language, and religion, and they have courageously resisted Soviet attempts to destroy their national identity through harsh and oppressive measures.

The brave people of Lithuania are to be commended for their admirable efforts in their struggle for human rights in their homeland. The Lithuanian people who have immigrated and escaped the tyranny of communism have not forgotten those they have left behind. I have received hundreds of letters this month from my own constituents of Lithuanian descent, pleading that we exercise our leadership role in the world, and fulfill our moral obligation, to denounce Soviet oppression in Lithuania, as well as the other Baltic States. I join with my Lithuanian constituents in urging freedom for the following political and religious prisoners: Viktoras Petkus and Balys Gajauskas (both of whom have been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize by the congressional Members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe); Mijole Sadunaite, S. Kovaliov, P. Paulaitis, S. Zukauskas, P. Plumpa, P. Petronis and A. Sakauskas. Their "crimes" were expressing basic human rights for Lithuanians. In addition, I urge that the Vaclovas Daunoras family be allowed to emigrate.

The United States has never recognized the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. Thus, I believe it is imperative that our U.S. representatives at the approaching Human Rights Conference confront the representatives of the Soviet Union concerning their blatant disregard of, and noncompliance with, the Final Act of the Helsinki Accords.

In past Congresses, we have recorded

our denunciation of the Soviet annexation of the Baltic areas through the passage of House resolutions. We must now insist that the Soviet Union restore the right of self-determination and territorial integrity to the Baltic nations. If we as a nation, and a people, are going to espouse "human rights", then we must recognize that that is a principle that cannot be applied selectively—we must support the cause of freedom throughout the world.●

#### TRIBUTE TO MRS. GRACE MOFFITT

### HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to offer my tribute to a truly outstanding constituent, Mrs. Grace Moffitt, a member of New Jersey's Barrington Borough Board of Education.

Mrs. Moffitt was first elected to the board of education in 1955 and will be honored for 24 years of service at a testimonial dinner Friday, June 22.

Prior to her election, Mrs. Moffitt served as president of Barrington's Culbertson School PTA and also served as Barrington's representative to Haddon Heights High School for 4 years.

In addition, Mrs. Moffitt was a Cub Scout den mother for 6 years, and a Little League, Babe Ruth League, and Garden State Baseball League volunteer. She supported the Jack Berger Basketball League as well.

A summer Bible school teacher for 3 years, Mrs. Moffitt returned to work in 1961 as a full-time teller for what is now the Heritage Bank in Haddon Heights. She moved to that bank's Fairlynne office in 1969 as an administrative assistant and became the manager of that office in 1972. In 1973, Mrs. Moffitt was named an officer of the bank and became its assistant cashier. She moved to the bank's Berlin office as assistant manager in 1974 and is currently employed there.

Mrs. Moffitt is presently a member of the National Association of Bank Women, the Barrington Women's Club, and the Barrington Juvenile Committee. She is an active member of the Laurel Springs Chapter OES. For relaxation, she has belonged to a card club for some 37 years.

Born in Cheltenham, Pa., Mrs. Moffitt moved to New Jersey in 1926. She graduated from Collingswood High School in 1934, won a scholarship to the Philadelphia Bank Business College, and, following that, was employed from 1936 to 1941 by the National Bank of Clementon.

Mrs. Moffitt married her husband, Casper, in August 1938. They have three sons, John, Jim, and Fred who are all married. The couple also has seven grandchildren, two of whom attend Barrington schools.

It is indeed an honor to have such a dedicated woman as a resident of my district. I take pride in joining Grace Moffitt's family and friends in recognizing her contributions to our community. She

is certainly deserving of this tribute as well as many more years of success and happiness.●

#### FAIR TRADE IMPORT LIMITATIONS ON SPECIALTY STEEL

### HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my voice to those Senators and Members of Congress deeply disappointed by President Carter's recent refusal to extend fair trade import limitations to the American specialty steel industry.

The failure of the President to provide for normal extension of the existing import limits on foreign specialty steel in this country is unacceptable.

This action by the President if unchallenged, will force American industry to compete with subsidized, foreign specialty steel. President Carter's act strikes a harmful blow to a strategic American industry, leaving its workers at the mercy of foreign source suppliers.

The American people should be aware of the critical role played by specialty steels in our energy, defense, chemical, and manufacturing industries. Specialty steels fill strategic materials requirements throughout our economy. The United States needs a healthy specialty steel industry.

It is inconceivable to me that the limitation on the dumping of foreign specialty steel in effect the past 3 years has not been extended by President Carter. By this action, the President demonstrates a gross insensitivity to some 65,000 specialty steel workers nationwide. During the past 3 years, there have been substantial investments and productivity advances in the industry which are still in progress. Why now pull out the rug from under them—at this critical juncture?

All of us who are members of the House Steel Caucus, as well as others familiar with the issue, are severely disappointed by President Carter's refusal to grant an extension of at least 18 months. Such an extension of the existing limits on foreign imports is needed to complete the revitalization process of the American specialty steel industry.

President Carter owes it to those working in the American steel industry to preserve fair trade in specialty steels. The Carter administration obviously has buckled under to foreign pressure and abandoned the fair trade laws passed by Congress governing this matter.

I call upon the President to reinstate the limits imposed by President Ford in 1976 on the dumping of foreign specialty steel. These positive actions must be continued if American workers in the vital American steel industry are to remain protected from predatory competition from Government-owned and Government-subsidized foreign producers. If we really want the American people to believe that free enterprise works, let us start applying it to the foreign trade arena.●

## TOBACCO

**HON. WALTER B. JONES**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 19, the House approved the agricultural appropriations bill for fiscal year 1980. Included were necessary funds to continue the tobacco support program as well as other funds for research.

Congressman SHUMWAY of California had planned to offer an amendment to this legislation which would have read as follows:

*Provided further, That no part of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act shall be obligated or expended for the salaries or expenses of any officer or employee to formulate, provide assistance in, or carry out any program relating to loans, price support, sales or other disposal functions performed with respect to tobacco or any tobacco product.*

Those of us concerned with the continuation of the very successful tobacco program were very much relieved and grateful when Congressman SHUMWAY announced that he would not offer his amendment. In this connection, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Tobacco, I have conducted in recent months four hearings in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia on the possibilities of replacing tobacco as a cash agricultural crop, and during these hearings developed some rather interesting information. For an example, an agricultural economist from the University of Georgia testified that to replace the cash income from 1 acre of tobacco for the 1977 season would require the cultivation of approximately 14 acres of soybeans or 15 acres of peanuts. Obviously there is not that much land available for such increased production to say nothing of the fact that both commodities are frequently in surplus.

In conclusion, I think one of the most interesting studies was released just this month by the Wharton Applied Research Center at the University of Pennsylvania. This surely must be considered an impartial study, and concluded that the U.S. tobacco industry contributed nearly \$50 billion to the national economy in 1977. The Wharton study measured the different consumer expenditures, industry investment, and the values of purchase of other industries derived from the tobacco industry's "core sectors." These sectors include farming, auction warehouses, cigarette manufacturing, wholesaling, and vending.

This model estimated that the industry, through the employment, incomes, and spending it generated, contributed \$40 billion to the national economy in the form of personal consumption expenditures on tobacco and other consumer products. The Wharton report also estimates that the tobacco industry's contributions to the Nation's employment, both directly and through its spillover effects on other industries,

amounted to 2,067,000 persons, and produced a total contribution of \$12 billion in Federal taxes and \$7.3 billion in State and local taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this statement and the facts contained therein will convince one and all of the necessity and the soundness of the present tobacco program as it relates to the total economy of this entire Nation.●

## PANAMA CANAL LEGISLATION

**HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Baltimore Sun carried the following powerful editorial on the issue of the pending Panama Canal legislation:

## PLAYING GAMES WITH THE CANAL

For the House of Representatives to prevent implementation of the Panama Canal treaties—the bill and crippling amendments—come to floor vote next week—would be to play with fire. It might well be, as Representatives David Bowen (D., Miss.) and Edward J. Derwinski (R., Ill.) wrote to their colleagues, to hand the canal over to Panama this year instead of in the year 2000 as called for by treaty.

The treaties are ratified. The Panama Canal Company, which operates the canal under the treaty of 1903, will lose authority to do so on October 1. The Panama Canal Zone will cease to exist. Nothing Congress can do can prevent this. Canal operations will remain in American control, however, if Congress provides it. Should Congress fail to establish the Panama Canal Commission authorized by treaty (with nine members, five American and four Panamanian, chosen by the U.S. Department of Defense) there would be no way to pay canal workers. No doubt the President might try to invent emergency authority, but the possibilities of canal stoppage, strikes, riots and sabotage would be real.

The administration and Panamanians believe that features of the House bill as it stands violate the treaties in letter or spirit, by putting part of the payments to Panama in jeopardy and by creating a closer subservience to the Department of Defense. These differences could probably be reconciled in House-Senate conference. Amendments offered by Representative George Hansen (R., Idaho), however, would nullify or repudiate the treaty. One would put incredible financial obligations on Panama before payments to Panama began. Another would require Panama to declare that the United States had been sovereign in the Canal Zone before the U.S. honored commitments. (In fact, the U.S. was never sovereign under the 1903 treaty, but had powers as though sovereign.) Nothing in the new treaties requires Panamanians to stand up before breakfast every morning and shout "Uncle!" but Mr. Hansen evidently thinks it would be fun to oblige them to do so under domestic American law.

The Senate Armed Services Committee has not yet held hearings or drafted its bill. But senators are unlikely to repudiate treaty obligations they ratified. Should the House act irresponsibly next week, the first attempt to repair the damage would presumably be through House action on the Senate's bill. That would be getting pretty close to a "Perils of Pauline" script, however. The inescapable fact is that the new treaty rela-

tionship will go into effect on October 1. To be in violation of the treaty on that date would be to put the security of the canal at frivolous risk.●

## REPUBLICANS SUPPORT "FREEDOM OF CHOICE" FOR BANKS

**HON. BUD SHUSTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican policy committee, which I chair, has unanimously agreed in an official policy position statement, to support the passage of the "Freedom of Choice Compromise Amendment" to section 3 of H.R. 7, the Monetary Control Act of 1979. Without this amendment our existing financial system will be radically restricted to the detriment of the Nation's economy and to the consumer.

I should like to share the wisdom of the policy committee's position with my colleagues at this point, and insert into the Record the complete text of the policy committee's statement:

## H.R. 7—MONETARY CONTROL ACT OF 1979

The "Monetary Control Act of 1979" is a radical restructuring of our existing financial system. In order to resolve the problem of declining membership, it authorizes the Federal Reserve System to subject all state and federally chartered depository institutions to a mandatory system of reserve requirements with exemptions for small depository institutions, purportedly, for the purposes of implementing monetary policy and fighting inflation.

The Republican Policy Committee strongly supports the passage of the "Freedom of Choice Compromise Amendment" to Section 3 of the bill to be offered by Representative J. William Stanton (R-Ohio). Essentially, the "Freedom of Choice Compromise Amendment" preserves the present voluntary system of reserve requirements, modifies and substantially reduces the heavy cost burdens of membership in the Federal Reserve System, thereby making membership in the Federal Reserve attractive and affordable to banks, and at the same time assuring adequate controls to effect monetary policy.

Maintaining the voluntary reserve requirement structure affects only member banks immediately upon enactment. If, at any time after enactment, the percentage of total bank deposits subject to Federal Reserve requirements fall below 66 percent then the mandatory provisions of H.R. 7, "The Monetary Control Act," replace the voluntary structure.

The advantages of the "Freedom of Choice Compromise Amendment" are: (1) it maintains the proud tradition of the voluntary reserve structure that has been in effect since the Federal Reserve was established in 1913 consistent with the original goal and desires of banks throughout the country; (2) it lowers reserve requirements significantly to make membership reasonably priced; (3) it continues the life and strength of the federal-state dual banking system since it does not impose federal reserve requirements on state chartered non-member banks, as does H.R. 7; (4) it results in greater monetary control by providing that reserve coverage under this voluntary approach will be 72 percent versus 66 percent under the mandatory approach of H.R. 7; (5) it phases



in lower reserves over a three year period, which is shorter than that contained in the mandatory approach of H.R. 7; and (6) it holds out the possibility for increased participation in the Federal Reserve System by reducing the costs of membership and resolves the real problem of declining membership in the Federal Reserve System.

The Republican Policy Committee concurs in the belief that the Nation needs a strong central bank to administer monetary policy and maintain a sound banking industry capable of responding to our domestic and international financial needs and objectives. Declining membership in the Federal Reserve System presents serious problems for controlling monetary policy and, particularly, during periods of high inflation. Responsible action should be taken to halt the attrition of member banks. However, there is not a crisis situation today which warrants the dramatic restructuring of our financial system provided by the mandatory provisions of the "Monetary Control Act of 1979."

The "Monetary Control Act of 1979" proposes more federal regulation of the private sector at a time when the American people are calling for less regulation. It terminates the historical tradition of voluntary membership in the Federal Reserve when changes in the present system can be made to stem declining membership without resorting to mandatory reserves and still maintain adequate monetary controls. The bill's mandatory reserve requirements can disrupt the well functioning and competitive feature of our federal-state dual banking system; it adversely impacts state economies by providing the incentive for many state chartered banks to exchange non-member status for federal membership in those states whose reserve requirements exceed those in H.R. 7; and it encourages switching charters to escape both federal and state requirements for those banks below the levels of exemptions provided in the bill.

Ironically, the exemption levels substantially reduce the number of banks subject to reserve requirements from 5,664 to 1,020 and decrease the Federal Reserve's deposit coverage from 72% to 66%, thus further weakening "monetary control" which the bill seeks to strengthen. These high exemption features of the bill actually reduce the degree of monetary control now contained in the present voluntary system. The mandatory provisions of the bill move the banking regulatory process toward increased and perhaps harmful federal control.

The Republican Policy Committee strongly urges the adoption of the "Freedom of Choice Compromise Amendment" to prevent this unwarranted change in our existing financial structure which could cause more harm than benefit to the Nation's economy and to the consumer.●

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, from Wednesday evening, June 13, through Friday, June 15, I was unable to attend to the legislative business on the calendar, missing 15 recorded votes, because of the passing away of a close personal friend and associate.

Had I been present, I would have voted as follows. I am itemizing my votes as a way of meeting my responsibility as a Congressman to the people I represent:

ROLL CALLS		
234. Yes.	239. No.	244. No.
235. No.	240. Yes.	245. Yes.
236. Yes.	241. Yes.	246. Yes.
237. No.	242. No.	247. Yes.
238. No.	243. Yes.	248. No.●

#### SHELVE SALT II UNTIL AFTER ELECTION

### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Senate, in its consideration of the SALT II Treaty, will guide the conduct and direction of this country's foreign and defense policy for years to come. The complexity of the treaty itself makes the ratification decision all the more difficult.

I am confident that the Senate will approach this task with great thought and deliberation. In order to enhance the opportunity of the Senate to proceed judiciously, I recommend that the Senate delay final debate and vote on ratification until after the 1980 national elections.

This is the first time in my 19 years in the House of Representatives that I have taken the liberty to recommend policy to the leadership of the Senate, an action I would ordinarily consider inappropriate.

I do so because of the gravity of the issue. The ratification process places on the Senate an enormous responsibility that goes far beyond the interests of our Nation, vital as these are. It goes directly to the most basic interests of our European allies and could have a crucial effect in time on the survival of free institutions worldwide. This responsibility has few, if any, parallels in political history. It is unprecedented because of the awesome role in human affairs occupied by nuclear weaponry and its technology.

A delay is important for several reasons:

First, the Senate faces a difficult task in ascertaining with accuracy the effect the treaty will have on the long term security interests of our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty.

Objectivity in the present political atmosphere is impossible. Given the long term, highly visible efforts of the U.S. administration to rally support for ratification, no NATO government can be expected today to voice even privately the slightest criticism. To do so would be viewed as an affront to our President, who serves as the ex officio leader of NATO, and who almost exclusively controls NATO's nuclear deterrent to Soviet military pressures.

Overcoming this atmosphere—that is to say, the process of eliciting facts and candid views—will take a considerable period of time even in a highly favorable atmosphere. I cannot see a proper atmosphere evolving until after the 1980 election.

Second, in addition, treaty issues range

far beyond strategic nuclear weapons. It is impossible to consider the SALT II Treaty and the strategic balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. without also taking into account the conventional and tactical nuclear imbalance between East and West. A disturbing disparity exists between the forces at the disposal of the Warsaw Pact and those of NATO; and this disparity is increasing.

Indeed, up to this point the Soviet Union has given no indication that it will put into practice the principle of parity for Europe. Soviet reluctance has been obvious in the prolonged MBFR negotiations and in Moscow's continuous upgrading of the Warsaw Pact capabilities in central Europe. We must be certain that the Soviet Union will agree to establish an overall equilibrium in the forces of East and West before this treaty can wisely be ratified.

Technical issues are very complex. Verification, for example, raises many questions and concerns.

Third, progress in a wide range of East-West issues has been extremely uneven.

Students of Soviet behavior have noted recently some favorable initiatives by the U.S.S.R. in anticipation of SALT II ratification. A delay in the treaty's consideration would provide the opportunity to determine whether this Soviet accommodation is merely tactical and superficial or whether it presages a deeper interest in advancing East-West understanding and cooperation.

Fourth, SALT II will likely have a great psychological impact on U.S. public opinion.

The Senate has a special challenge in that it must somehow become a classroom through which the entire Nation can understand the complexities of SALT II as they relate to our total security situation worldwide. Our citizens will need the leavening influence of extensive and thoughtful discussion, separated as much as possible from emotion and partisan tides.

Hasty consideration in the atmosphere of a Presidential campaign—which, of course, is already well underway—might so warp public perceptions as to force damaging policy decisions. To illustrate it would create the ill-founded notion that SALT II, heralding the millennium of peace, makes logical substantial cutbacks in other U.S. military programs. This might generate a rising sentiment for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe.

In short, the issues and various considerations involved in SALT II are so towering as to call for an exceptional period of deliberation.●

#### TRIBUTE TO MARY B. FEDERSPIILL

### HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, an honor for me to come before

this House in order to recognize a constituent of mine, Mary B. Federspill. Mrs. Federspill, of Empire, Ohio, will retire on June 29, 1979, after serving 30 years as postmaster of that community.

As postmaster, Mary has served the area well. She exemplified professionalism and dedication and has made loyalty to her town, its people, and the U.S. Government a priority in her life. Even more important, perhaps, is her willingness to help others in anyway she can. She has acted as a friend, an adviser and a teacher to hundreds.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Postal Service was very fortunate, indeed, to have as one of its postmasters, Mary Federspill. She is one who the Service and the people of Empire will miss as postmaster. ●

#### FURTHER MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT

#### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, further to the remarks and letters I placed in the June 15, 1979, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 15124 and 15125, I am today placing a revised version of the letter from certain Senators to the President relative to our policy toward Nicaragua. It also contains an additional signature. As events are proceeding at the rapid pace in Nicaragua, U.S. policy in this regard becomes of paramount importance.

The article follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., June 19, 1979.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We find it difficult to understand the attitude of this administration toward the deteriorating situation in Nicaragua.

That the armed invaders identify themselves as "Marxist-Leninists" and seek to impose a Cuban-style regime in Nicaragua is beyond question. That the present government of Nicaragua has been unfailingly friendly and cooperative toward the United States is also beyond question.

Surely it cannot be considered in the national interest to acquiesce in the imposition of a Communist dictatorship in Nicaragua. Such a change would place neighboring states under intense pressure.

Yet we find that the attitude of our government is one of cold hostility toward our friends. Our government has, for example, worked for many months to obstruct normal financial transactions between the government of Nicaragua and the International Monetary Fund. Since this activity has no other effect than to weaken the Nicaraguan people, it amounts to an indirect support of the guerrillas.

Is this in fact the policy of our government? And if so, why?

Sincerely,

ROGER W. JEPSEN,  
GORDON HUMPHREY,  
STROM THURMOND,  
JESSE HELMS,  
ORRIN G. HATCH,  
JIM MCCLURE. ●

#### HOME HEATING OIL PROBLEMS AHEAD

#### HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, the television news last night carried a report that our colleague, TOBY MOFFETT, has discovered Government documents predicting a shortage of home heating oil this winter. Quite frankly, we do not need those documents to tell us that there is a big problem ahead, but it is helpful to have the added focus for the public's attention.

On May 17 I chaired hearings in the Small Business Committee, examining the diesel fuel supply situation. While our primary purpose was to look at the problem of assuring adequate diesel fuel supplies for agricultural production, it was readily apparent that there is a broader problem in middle distillate fuels, a category that includes both diesel and home heating oil. I placed a preliminary report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 30.

It is generally accepted that we must have at least 249 million barrels of middle distillate in storage by October 1, in order to meet our home heating oil requirements this winter. Once the frost sets in, we will be drawing down on that inventory until the spring.

Last month, when we held our hearings, the distillate fuels inventory stood at about 115 million barrels. That is the lowest level it's been in years.

To increase the inventory, the administration in late April began asking refiners to voluntarily increase their production of home heating oil and diesel fuel. They also instituted a program that amounts to a \$5 subsidy for each barrel of refined distillate fuel that is imported into this country.

At a meeting 2 days ago, Department of Energy officials told me that we are now up to about 128 million barrels in inventory, a reversal of the decline in middle distillate stocks that we had seen throughout the year.

Nonetheless, I am alarmed by the fact that the current rate of growth for the inventory is now about 3 million barrels a week, according to DOE and industry statistics. By my calculations, we need to be adding between 7 and 8 million barrels a week between now and October. At the present rate, then, inventory is building less than half as fast as it should, and we may end up with a deficit of as much as 25 or 30 percent this winter.

There are very few areas where we can reduce consumption of diesel fuel to conserve additional amounts for the winter. Agricultural production, public transportation, and industrial uses all have little margin for cutbacks in consumption. The current unrest in the trucking industry illustrates the problems that result from reducing the flow of diesel fuel.

The only feasible and responsible course, then, is to take such steps as are

necessary to increase immediately the production of middle distillate fuels. This can be accomplished by tilting refinery production away from gasoline and toward diesel and home heating oil.

Traditionally, at this time of year refiners maximize gasoline production in order to meet the increased demand caused by summer vacations and other uses of private automobiles. Conceivably, a shift to middle distillates and away from gasoline might aggravate the gasoline shortages now being experienced in some parts of the country. This is a risk we must take.

There is no area of petroleum product usage with greater potential for immediate energy savings than the private automobile. It is unpleasant to contemplate, but if any cuts in fuel supply must be made in order to be able to heat our homes and keep our commerce and industry running, then we must look to gasoline production as the item to be sacrificed.

That decision must be made now. It is clear that it is not sufficient to merely suggest voluntary action by the oil companies. The administration must act now to compel an immediate swing to greater production of home heating oil and diesel fuel. If such action is not taken right away, we face a potential catastrophe this winter. ●

#### WILLIAM D. BOYCE, FOUNDER OF SCOUTING

#### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, June 11, 1979, marked the 50th anniversary of the death of a man who left Americans a timeless legacy, one which has already influenced the lives of more than 63 million young men and will touch those of millions more in years to come.

The name of this great benefactor: William D. Boyce. His gift to our Nation's young men, past, present, and future: the Boy Scouts of America.

Mr. Boyce is credited with founding the scouting movement, which has produced so many great leaders, and later merged it with another program he established for rural youths who cannot conveniently join the usual scout pack or troop—the Lone Scouts of America.

Mr. Boyce is a native of Allegheny County in Pennsylvania and it was fitting the anniversary of his passing was observed at a site also dedicated to preparing young men and women for the future and one named in his honor—Boyce Campus of the Allegheny County Community College, located in my 20th Congressional District.

The memorial observance was initiated by John W. Caskey, Sr., of Aspers, Pa., a member of the BSA's national advisory committee on the Lone Scout program. Mr. Caskey recited a prayer composed for the occasion by the Reverend Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, chaplain for the U.S. Senate.



Also participating in the service was Mrs. Elizabeth Benson Wolf, president of the Allegheny County League of Women Voters and a daughter of the former director of the Boy Scouts' Lone Scout Division, the late Oscar H. Benson. Mrs. Wolf placed a wreath beneath a portrait of the founding father of scouting in America.

Other dignitaries taking part in the memorial ceremony included Dr. Richard W. McDowell, vice president and executive dean of Boyce Campus; James J. Bruce, his assistant; Ralph L. Margolis, the campus librarian who read a tribute to Mr. Boyce written by Ernest L. Gambell of Silver Spring, Md., chairman of the advisory committee for the Lone Scout program and a member at large of the national council for BSA, and Matthew McClung, an Eagle Scout from Troop 141 who has become a leading authority on the life of the man who left so much to so many.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD at this time the prayer written by Reverend Elson and the tribute by Mr. Gambell commemorating William D. Boyce, whose life's work lives on in every Boy Scout in America.

#### PRAYER

God of our fathers and our God, before whom the generations rise and pass away, we thank Thee for leaders of lofty vision, noble purpose and sacrificial service in every generation. We thank Thee for the sacred memories which cluster about William Dickson Boyce, Founder of Scouting in the United States.

Grateful for his vision and his idealism in our youth we pray that some measure of his spirit may fall on us again that we may be wise as he was wise, true as he was true, loyal as he was loyal.

May we be steadfast in our love of life, our devotion to freedom, our intolerance of evil, our dedication to justice and our pursuit of peace throughout the world.

And may goodness and mercy follow us all our days that we may abide with Thee forever. Amen.

#### TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM DICKSON BOYCE

Fifty years ago today, on June 11, 1929, the Founder of Scouting in the United States (the Boy Scouts of America and the Lone Scouts of America) left "his boys" to "pass beyond the sunset." At this 50th anniversary, it is most fitting for those who have been the beneficiaries of the great thing he started to remember the vision and the faith implicit in his message of 55 years ago on the occasion of the union of the two great organizations that he initiated:

"I have given fifteen years—the best years of my life—to this work for the American boy, and will remain his faithful friend until I am called to another world, where I hope to meet when they arrive, hundreds of thousands of friendly boys who will remember that I tried to do something for them on earth. With Love to All Boys, Truly, W. D. Boyce"

On the occasion of his demise, associates of Mr. Boyce spoke glowing tributes. President Walter W. Head and Chief Scout Executive James E. West of the Boy Scouts of America jointly said:

"The entire American Nation owes Mr. Boyce a debt of gratitude, and the citizens of the future will be better prepared to serve their country because of his outstanding Good Turn."

The Reverend Edward Lathrop, who had been one of the early Lone Scouts and who

continued for many years as a Scouter and earned many Scouting honors, wrote a quarter-century after Mr. Boyce left us:

"His contribution to the material, cultural, and spiritual growth of America through Scouting is beyond measure."

We here today can add little to the luster of the name William D. Boyce, for it already graces many memorials, including this campus, and is a direct part of the heritage of 63 million who have borne the title Scout or Scouter. We can and do join in continuing to help his dream come true: Exemplification of Scouting principles in our lives and service to the youth of our generations.●

#### IMPACT OF SYNTHETIC FUELS

#### HON. ALLEN E. ERTEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. ERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for publication in the RECORD my testimony which I have just prepared for the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, and on Employment Opportunities, which have conducted hearings on the subject of the impact of the synthetic fuels industry on labor and manpower training.

My testimony deals with a cost competitive, environmentally safe but little appreciated synfuel: anthracite gas, which has been used successfully in three industrial plants in Pennsylvania. The unique opportunities presented by this technology warrants consideration and attention from every Member of Congress, particularly my colleagues from the Northeast.

The testimony follows:

#### TESTIMONY BY MR. ERTEL

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate your affording me an opportunity to present testimony related to your investigation into the synthetic fuels industry. While I am going to stray somewhat from the theme of the synfuels industry's impact on labor and manpower training, I think in the long run my comments will touch on this issue.

My district is part of the vast anthracite mining region in Pennsylvania, a region with approximately 18.8 billion tons in identified resources, representing about 96 percent of the total domestic supply of this coal. The reserve base, i.e., the in-place deposits that are relatively thick and near enough to the land surface to allow mining by conventional surface and underground methods, has been pegged at 7.1 billion tons in Pennsylvania.

Despite the enormous potential contribution anthracite utilization could make in our campaign to achieve energy independence, this resource has gone virtually unnoticed by the Administration's so-called coal policy. Receiving even less attention than the issue of direct burning of this low-sulphur coal, however, are the possibilities associated with deriving synthetic fuels from anthracite.

Anthracite gasification presents a particularly attractive energy option for the Northeast region of the country. Three plants in Pennsylvania, one of which is located in my district, have been utilizing anthracite gasification for some time, with results that could persuade even the most dour critic of the worth of this technology. The process at one plant, the Glen-Gery brick plant in York, was a DOE sponsored project which terminated in June of this year. The cost of the low-Btu anthracite-derived gas was

\$2.37/MM Btu (in a new installation today, the gas costs would run about \$2.50/MM Btu), as compared with a natural gas price of \$3.00/MM Btu in many parts of Pennsylvania. The plant's gas price breakdown looks like this:

	MM Btu
Anthracite coal cost (at \$45 per ton) .....	\$1.861
Equipment cost (depreciation) .....	.159
Operational costs .....	.248
Maintenance costs .....	.067

Another Glen-Gery brick plant, located in the Borough of Watsonstown in my district, switched back to anthracite gas, a process the plant had abandoned when "cheap" natural gas became available. Their new mix of 15 percent natural gas (at \$3.25/mcf) and 85 percent anthracite gas (at a comparable \$2.25/mcf) results in a savings to the plant of \$20,000 per month.

Like the DOE-sponsored system, the Watsonstown plant achieves a 90 percent hot gas conversion efficiency, i.e., 90 percent of the Btu content in the anthracite (at 12,700 Btu/lb.) is contained in the hot gas at 700 degrees F. The high-quality, low-sulphur anthracite fuel affords such high conversion efficiencies because no tars or oils are produced in the process. For other coals, cleaning tars and oils from producer gas is costly due to the equipment required—its purchase, operation and maintenance. The simplicity of anthracite gasification plants results in substantial savings.

The third plant, Howmet Aluminum Corporation of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, has, within the last year, installed an anthracite gasifier, the hot gas from which will be used for aluminum melting.

I have enclosed for the subcommittees' information a graph which depicts the potential fuel costs savings over natural gas or oil of one gasifier converting one ton/hour of anthracite into industrial fuel gas or boiler fuel. This graph was prepared by Gas Generation Associates, a division of Acurex Corporation, of Reading, Pennsylvania, and a group that has been promoting the use of anthracite gasification.

Even this limited experience with anthracite gasification that I have cited demonstrates both the viability and economics of this technology. However DOE has shown very little interest in pursuing more widespread utilization of low and medium BTU gas, maintaining that gas derived from coal cannot successfully compete with traditional fossil fuels. I think the experience of these plants shows the fallacy of that argument. This is a disturbing attitude to have towards a demonstrated and proven, cost-competitive, and environmentally clean (anthracite gasification produces no emissions to pose any environmental dangers) technology that utilizes an abundant rather than a scarce resource. DOE's assessment is that there is no market for this technology on a large scale (such as one gasifier serving more than one industrial plant). To the department's credit, the Office of Utility and Industrial Applications has developed a "Low/Medium Gasification Assessment Program for Potential Users." Nonetheless, while continuing to fund small-scale demonstration projects, its pursuit of furthering this technology has been somewhat lackluster.

Anthracite gasification presents a unique opportunity to pursue a regional solution to our energy problems, and the regional economy could only benefit from the availability of a low-cost, clean-burning industrial fuel and the revitalization of the anthracite industry that would accompany increased use of this resource. All of this would have no small impact on the issue of most immediate concern to the subject of your inquiry: the impact of the synfuels industry on employment and manpower training.

First, a vigorous application of anthracite

gasification technology to industries throughout the Northeast would stimulate growth of a components manufacturing and servicing industry; though this may only be a small, regionally-based business, it would nonetheless create jobs and a demand for skilled laborers and technicians.

Secondly, depending on the presently used fuel, low-cost energy supply could reduce an industry's production costs, perhaps encouraging production expansion and the hiring of new employees. Even if anthracite gas were no less expensive than the fuel currently consumed by the plant's operations (i.e., even if the company did not experience a net financial savings by converting), there could be other advantages that could effectuate an economic savings regionally that would result in economic growth and increased employment. Such advantages include a reduction in oil imports (a particular concern in the Northeast); stimulation of investments into new or marginal operations, thereby enhancing competition, not to mention the benefits associated with a revitalized anthracite industry: demand for labor to mine the coal; better transportation facilities; enhancement of the economy of the anthracite region and its attendant benefits, etc. As a matter of fact, preliminary, job-creating steps would have to be taken—manufacture of more coal-hauling railroad cars; perhaps construction of new delivery terminals; the development of better mining techniques and equipment and the training of miners—before a widespread demand for anthracite could be satisfied. There is a vicious circle that could develop here; the demand may not appear without an assurance of supply, but the many preparations for assuring such supply may not be taken unless there is a sure market. In order to further some very worthwhile employment- and energy-related goals, Congress and the Administration must act decisively to promote anthracite gasification.●

#### SUPPORT FOR THE ACP

### HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, conservation and the simultaneous planned usage of our resources is the one reason we are able to maintain our place in the world agricultural community. Americans are better fed at cheaper costs, and export more food and fiber items than any other nation on Earth. This increased production of quality food items is no accidental occurrence. Only through proper management and constant attention to our farm lands can we hope to continue our history of protecting and preserving our fertile lands to gain ever increasing yields of food and fiber.

The agricultural conservation program is a longstanding program which promotes and exemplifies this ideal. By conserving and improving water resource quality, controlling animal waste pollution, controlling erosion, conserving wildlife, improving our forests and encouraging cooperation toward common goals the ACP has gained the acceptance and support of both the Congress and the American farmer. This longstanding program, benefiting from the personal co-

operation of our farmers, and with Federal cost sharing, serves as the basis for our ongoing efforts to maximize our food and fiber production while preserving the productivity of our prime farmlands for future generations.

I fully support the action of the Appropriations Committee in restoring much needed funding for the ACP. Past Congresses have seen the wisdom of this program, and have supported restoration of ACP funds. With the support shown yesterday by the House, this program will continue to benefit all Americans through the cooperative conservation and management of our agricultural resources.●

#### GEORGE BALL SUPPORTS PANAMA CANAL LEGISLATION

### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished lawyer, financier, and former Under Secretary of State, George W. Ball, has written to the House leadership that failure of the House of Representatives to approve the implementing legislation for the Panama Canal Treaty would be highly damaging to our country. The text of Mr. Ball's letter is as follows:

JUNE 7, 1979.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,  
U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As a former United States Under Secretary of State and Ambassador to the United Nations, I am convinced that the failure of the House of Representatives to approve the implementing legislation for the Panama Canal Treaty would be highly damaging to our country.

The American people have settled the issues involved in the Panama Canal Treaties after lengthy debate and in accordance with the procedures laid down by the United States Constitution.

During the course of that substantive debate great emphasis was placed on the significance of the Treaties to our relations with other Latin American states. I am concerned with an even more important issue—our ability to sustain confidence in American leadership among our Western allies and, indeed, in the whole non-Communist world.

I have just returned from Europe, depressed at pervasive doubts as to the effectiveness of American leadership. An accusation widely heard is that the United States constitutional system is no longer adequate for the requirements of the present complex world. It is widely contended that governments can no longer safely rely on the word of the United States President, because he cannot carry Congress with him, and, even if he signs a treaty, it may not be ratified.

Though that developing attitude is a matter of concern, the uncertainty involved in ratification is implicit in our Constitution, and defensible in those terms. But once the United States people have settled a problem through their own constitutional processes, and a treaty has been ratified, and has thus become the law of the land, I would find it indefensible that the Congress should prevent our good-faith carrying out of that treaty by a refusal to pass implementing legislation. Such an action would be a lethal

blow to American prestige and authority; it would weaken and embarrass our friends and give aid and comfort to the most vicious anti-American elements. I cannot believe that the United States Congress would be guilty of such mischievous and irresponsible action.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. BALL.●

#### THE ADVANTAGES OF SALT II

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for Wednesday, June 20, 1979, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The United States and the Soviet Union have reached basic agreement on a second strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT II) to restrain the nuclear arms race. Although the treaty will not come before the House of Representatives for approval, I support it and hope that the Senate will ratify it.

In general, I regard SALT II as an essential step toward a safer world. Its major accomplishments are that (1) it establishes equal ceilings on U.S. and Soviet strategic forces, (2) it begins an actual reduction in the level of nuclear arms, and (3) it places the first limits on the qualitative race in nuclear weaponry (that is, the race to build new weapons systems and to improve existing ones). Moreover, SALT II has several specific advantages. The most compelling are these:

1. SALT II will reduce the risk of nuclear war. It establishes for the first time the principle that the two sides should have equal numbers of missile launchers and heavy bombers (2,250). The Soviet Union will have to dismantle 250 strategic delivery systems to reach that level, so the momentum of the current Soviet build-up of weapons will be broken. The treaty places equal limits on missiles equipped with several warheads which can be aimed independently to hit more than one target (the "MIRV" missile). It places limits on the race to build new and more sophisticated weapons systems and to improve existing strategic weapons. However, the treaty does not interfere with any of our defense programs. It will slow the growth of Soviet arms and limit strategic competition. By helping to define the threats we might face, the treaty will make our defense planning more effective. It will mean greater stability and predictability in the strategic challenge we face.

2. SALT II is the next phase in a process which may eventually bring nuclear arms under complete control. That process has been favored by five Presidents over the past 15 years, and it has produced significant results (the limited test ban treaty, the anti-ballistic missile treaty, and SALT I, which froze overall numbers of strategic weapons). The accord must be seen as groundwork for a more enduring political relationship between antagonistic nations with awesome power. Every country on earth has a stake in that relationship, and our allies count on us to manage it well. It is worth noting that the leaders of Great Britain, West Germany, and France all have expressed support for SALT II.

3. We can determine for ourselves whether the Soviet Union is living up to obligations under SALT II. We have insisted that compliance with the accord be verifiable since the risks are too high to rely on trust alone. We have a variety of intelligence collection



systems with which we can observe Soviet military activity. Any cheating on a scale that would upset the strategic balance could be detected in time for us to make a vigorous response.

4. If SALT II is rejected, the consequences could be grave. Without SALT II, tensions with the Soviet Union would heighten. The arms race would grow more dangerous and more expensive. The Soviets would probably begin an enormous build-up, and more weapons would be developed on both sides at enormous cost (an estimated extra cost of \$30 billion to the United States over the next decade). The slow process of arms control would be dealt a crippling blow, and the world would decide that the two superpowers had chosen confrontation rather than cooperation.

SALT II is no substitute for a strong defense. We must have the unquestioned capacity to convince any potential adversary that an attack on us or our allies would mean equal or greater destruction for the attacker. To maintain such a capacity in the years ahead, I support the extensive modernization of our strategic forces. We must equip our heavy bombers with cruise missiles, put long-range Trident I missiles on our submarines, deploy our Trident submarines fully, improve our land-based Minuteman missiles, and go forward with development of a mobile missile. Such modernization is possible under provisions of SALT II.

I do not have exaggerated expectations for SALT II. It will not sharply reduce defense spending or remove all threats against us. Nor will it suddenly usher in a new era of U.S.-Soviet cooperation. Our military and political rivalry with the Soviet Union spans the globe, and it will not be so easily contained. The hopes may be legitimate, but given the nature of the U.S.-Soviet relationship they are not likely to be realized in the near future.

The fundamental question posed by SALT II is clear: do we move ahead with strategic arms control, or do we resume an unchecked and relentless arms race? Our real choice is an acceptable agreement which preserves and enhances our national security, or no agreement at all. SALT II represents a measurable advance in improving our nation's defense. It holds strategic forces in verifiable equivalence while it slows the arms race. My view is that the world would become a far more dangerous place than it is without SALT II. ●

#### ENERGY CRISIS AND CONSERVATION

### HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, James Waltersdorf, a resident of the 19th Congressional District in Pennsylvania recently delivered the following speech at his graduation from Southwestern High School. Although this message concentrates on the energy crisis, it more importantly reveals a willingness among young Americans to assume the responsibilities of conservation essential to the maintenance of America's greatness. I call this young gentleman's remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF JAMES WALTERSDORF

It is sometimes the habit of classes graduating in the last year of a decade to reflect on peculiar distinctions of that decade and their influence on the progress of the class' education. The Class of 1979 is the product

of an era during which an important cultural change occurred: the transformation of a nation of technological strength to a nation of technological drunkenness.

After World War II, our nation was at the acme of its strength and esteem. National production was increasing, and the most advanced technology in the world was giving America the highest standard of living. At about the same time that our class began elementary school, the change was beginning to take form. Our country was a social battleground in those days. You all remember the 1960's. Riots, campus takeovers, drug abuse, and general disenchantment with the established social system were widespread among the younger generation. Those were the symptoms of a new "ME" Generation which believed that individual welfare was more important than the welfare of the whole nation. Our elder brothers protested America's involvement in Vietnam because the war was a threat to their secure lifestyle.

And so the screaming continued, but it did not stop the war. We are paying for that mistake today. What we should have learned in these past twelve years is that such a determination to avoid responsibility and a refusal to face the reality of sacrifice are detrimental to each individual in a generation. We would be wise not to forget this lesson.

The United States we expect to inherit is but a technicolor dream composed of a variety of so-called "necessities" which are nothing but creature comforts. Because we are dangerously attached to these luxuries, we suffer from an incredible myopia which prevents us from seeing a genuine emergency when it stares us in the face. Such is the case today with the energy crisis.

We are raised in this country amid unheard-of abundance and an indignant sense of self-preservation. When our lifestyle is threatened, we resist. We do not want our lives disrupted. We do not want our wealth taken from us. But we must realize that to avoid sacrifice and responsibility is to face destruction. Our destiny is our choice. America's senseless habit of scapegoating its problems is a consequence of the actions of its younger generation in the late 1960's. As they blamed the government for the Vietnam war, so we blame the government, big oil companies, even our parents for the energy shortage when the blame rests squarely on us, the most wasteful people on earth.

If you remember nothing else of what I'm saying, remember this: Feel free to maintain your lifestyle if you wish; but don't be fooled into thinking that the affluence we have known since childhood will last forever. We have a clear choice: sacrifice and save, or maintain and perish.

I really don't think that the United States will join Rome, Atlantis, and Carthage in the graveyard of civilizations, because I have great faith in American ingenuity and determination. We have the ability to rise to the occasion when properly motivated. But learn to sacrifice. Realize that the greatness of America is derived from selflessness and, yes, pain. Educate yourself. Know a limit to your indulgences. And realize your responsibility for our destiny. Do these and we can control the course of history. The future is our choice! ●

A BAT MITZVA "IN ABSENTIA" IN EAST ROCKAWAY, N.Y., TELLS A FAMILY IN KHARKOV, RUSSIA: WE ARE WITH YOU

### HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1979, I had the honor to attend an event

at the Hewlett-East Rockaway Jewish Center in my Fourth Congressional District which deserves the attention of all Members of Congress and all U.S. officials involved in dealings with the Soviet Union, because it shows most clearly that the Soviet regime is continuing a calculated campaign of harassment and persecution against Soviet Jews.

On June 2, the Congregation Etz Chaim of the Hewlett-East Rockaway Jewish Center celebrated a Bat Mitzva for its adopted daughter, Dorina Paritsky, 13, in absentia. Dorina could not attend. Neither could her father and mother, nor her younger sister. The Paritsky family lives in Kharkov, Russia, under the close scrutiny of the dreaded Soviet secret police, the KGB, and is subjected to the cruelest sort of public harassment and persecution.

The Paritskys, in fact, have become the focal point for anti-Jewish sentiment in Kharkov because in 1976 they sought permission to emigrate to Israel. Although the target of vicious newspaper articles and denunciations at officially sponsored public meetings, the Paritskys have held courageously to their insistence for the freedom to practice the religion of their choice in the land of their choice—Israel.

Because of the official persecution, the Paritskys could not celebrate their daughter's Bat Mitzva. But they knew of the ceremony being held on her behalf in the United States, thousands of miles away. Abraham and Helen Neufeld of the Congregation Etz Chaim had been informed of the plight of the Paritsky family by the Long Island Committee for Soviet Jewry, which, under the leadership of its President, Lynn Singer, has done so much for the human rights cause.

The Congregation Etz Chaim enthusiastically endorsed the Neufeld's idea for a Bat Mitzva, in absentia, for Dorina as a way to direct American attention to the plight of the Paritskys. The Paritskys were delighted when they were informed of the plan and wrote the Neufelds: "We hope it will bring the most desirable result—we will receive visas at last."

The knowledge of the persecution being experienced by the Paritsky family in Kharkov made Dorina's Bat Mitzva most moving and poignant for all of us who took part. As Dorina's proxy, Susan Berch of East Rockaway responded in the age-old ceremony marking the transition from girlhood to womanhood. During the moving religious ceremony, there were tears in the eyes of many congregants, thinking of Dorina and her family, denied the freedom to properly celebrate this meaningful milestone in their daughter's life.

Mr. Speaker, that service in the Hewlett-East Rockaway Jewish Center brought home with stunning force the realization of the great deprivation experienced by the Soviet Jews who are denied the full expression of their religion. The Paritsky family is only one of thousands being held hostage to the heartless and cruel policies of oppression and persecution.

I cite this account, Mr. Speaker, to explain why I am dispatching a letter to Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev, en-

closing a copy of this statement, and demanding that he end the long persecution of the Paritsky family by allowing them to realize their fondest dream: freedom in Israel. In denying this family—and the many other Soviet Jews who seek to emigrate to Israel—Leonid Brezhnev and his regime are knowingly violating the letter and the spirit of the Helsinki accords which Mr. Brezhnev himself signed with such dramatic flourishes in 1975. Such blatant violations of this solemn international pact should serve to make all of us very skeptical of Soviet promises to limit strategic weapons in the SALT II Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this appeal on behalf of the Paritsky family. I am confident our messages will be of assistance. Recently, the Soviets have released a number of Soviet Jews adopted as "prisoners of conscience" by Americans. One of those freed from prison and permitted to go to Israel was Hillel Butman, who has been my Fourth District's "prisoner of conscience" for nearly 4 years. To me, the release of these Soviet Jews demonstrates that the Russian Government does respond—however reluctantly or belatedly—to public appeals on behalf of Soviet Jews. Therefore, now that we have made some progress, we must not slacken our efforts.

To the contrary, we must redouble our demands for full human rights under the Helsinki accords for all Soviet Jews attempting to leave the oppressive atmosphere of the Soviet Union for the freedom of Israel. We must come to the assistance of courageous families like the Paritskys who are fighting for their beliefs against a most brutal campaign of social pressure and official harassment and denial.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in demanding that the Paritsky family be allowed to emigrate to Israel.●

#### FOREIGN TAX CREDITS

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, last week George Washington University law professor J. Reid Hambrick filed a criminal complaint concerning foreign tax credits claimed by Arabian American Oil Co.—Aramco—charging that the Treasury illegally gave away \$6 billion in tax credits to Aramco—jointly owned by Exxon, Mobil, Texaco, and Socal. Professor Hambrick specifically alleges in his complaint that the Internal Revenue Service failed to enforce the applicable income tax laws for 1974–78 and allowed Aramco to claim foreign tax credits to which it was not entitled.

The Committee on Government Operations in House Report No. 95–1240, entitled "Foreign Tax Credits Claimed by U.S. Petroleum Companies," dated June 1, 1978, unanimously took this position.

Mr. Hambrick deserves a prompt and expedited answer to his letter to the De-

partment of Justice. Yesterday, Secretary of Treasury Blumenthal appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to argue that no change was needed and that, essentially, IRS and Treasury continue to rule and administer the foreign tax credits based on past practice. He did advocate a few changes that would not allow foreign tax credits accumulated by one foreign oil subsidiary to be used to offset taxes on profits of operating shipping or refining subsidiaries in tax haven jurisdictions. Last week's newly announced Treasury/IRS regulations relating to foreign tax credits claimed by U.S. petroleum companies are not as stringent as the guidelines in present IRS rulings such as the 1976 Indonesian ruling. The basic problem is that Treasury/IRS allows its interpretation of the law to be influenced by special interest lobbyists, as disclosed in the Commerce, Consumer, and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee hearings and report on the foreign oil tax credit issue. I particularly draw your attention to the subcommittee's hearing on March 13, 1979, entitled "Interrelationship Between U.S. Tax Policy and U.S. Tax Energy Policy." Also, in 1976 the Secretary of State and the Office of International Affairs of the Treasury urged that Treasury/IRS continue to consider State's foreign policy goal of furthering U.S. multinational oil company production in OPEC countries and block issuance of a new tax ruling disallowing the foreign tax credits claimed by U.S. petroleum companies operating in Indonesia.

On the surface this was not complied with. The ruling was made that the earlier Indonesian oil tax credit ruling was erroneous but the Secretary of Treasury ordered the effects of the ruling be made prospective and delayed. The Tax Reform Act of 1976 granted another 1-year delay prior to the effective date of the Indonesian ruling. In the meantime, Business Week reported that an eminent U.S. law firm, at the direction of Indonesia, the oil companies and "in conjunction with IRS came up with a re-jiggering of the terminology—and some of the mechanics—of the agreements." On May 9, 1978, a new IRS tax ruling was announced which allows tax credits for the U.S. oil companies operating in Indonesia.

In the 1976 Indonesia ruling, the IRS ruled that "taxes" paid in connection with production sharing contracts were ineligible for a foreign tax credit unless they met the tests set forth in the ruling. The May 1978 ruling is significant for its conclusions about arm's-length bargaining. The IRS had ruled earlier that payments to a foreign government would not qualify as creditable foreign taxes unless the tax is imposed on income determined on the basis of arm's-length amounts actually realized in a manner consistent with U.S. income taxation principles. The contract that was considered in the new ruling and that was held to satisfy this test however, continues to give the Indonesian Government de facto control over price by permitting it "to reserve the right to insure that amounts reported as gross income by contractors do in fact reflect the market value of production sold by them." Because OPEC sets price

there is no independent market value for the oil and the new system is virtually identical to posted pricing. The result focuses on form rather than substance.

It is fundamental that IRS will not recognize "tax avoidance schemes" which are attempts to place form over substance for the purpose of evading taxes. Taxpayers with lesser political clout would not be permitted to engage in such a sham arrangement. Nevertheless, we find it incredulous that Treasury and IRS have failed to effectively administer the tax code. Can we continue to allow Treasury/IRS to conduct business as usual in the foreign oil tax credit area at a minimum loss to the U.S. Treasury of \$1.5 billion per year?

The Washington Star, on June 18, 1979, published an excellent article based on Mr. Hambrick's complaint, entitled "Aramco's Oil Tax Credits Provoke Professor to Sue." I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

#### ARAMCO'S OIL TAX "CREDITS" PROVOKE PROFESSOR TO SUE

(By Robert Pear, Washington Star staff writer)

A George Washington University law professor has filed a criminal complaint charging that the Treasury illegally gave away \$6 billion in tax credits to multinational oil companies.

The biggest beneficiary was the Arabian American Oil Co. (Aramco), which is responsible for virtually all the oil production in Saudi Arabia.

Professor J. Reid Hambrick wrote to Attorney General Griffin Bell last week asking for a grand jury investigation to determine who was responsible for what Hambrick described as a "scandalous act . . . a gigantic fraud on the U.S. government."

Specifically, he said the Internal Revenue Service had failed to enforce the applicable income tax laws for 1974–78 and had allowed Aramco to claim foreign tax credits to which it was not entitled for excise taxes paid to the Saudi government.

Excise taxes, imposed on each barrel of oil, cannot be credited against income taxes owed to the U.S. government, Hambrick said. Hambrick, 61, worked in the IRS chief counsel's office from 1949 to 1957.

Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal, D-N.Y., chairman of a House subcommittee that investigated the issue, said the foreign tax credits were clearly "impermissible."

In a recent letter to the White House, Rosenthal said the Treasury was losing more than \$1 billion a year because of illegitimate tax credits allowed to Aramco and other oil companies operating overseas. The companies all do business in states belonging to the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries.

"Taxpayers with lesser political clout would not be permitted to engage in such a sham arrangement," Rosenthal said in a letter to President Carter.

The letter was signed by Rosenthal and five other Democrats on the commerce, consumer and monetary affairs subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee.

A subcommittee spokesman said the White House had not answered or acknowledged the six-page letter, sent more than a month ago.

Aramco, an oil company operating in Saudi Arabia, is owned by four U.S. companies—Standard Oil of California, Exxon, Texaco and Mobil.

Hambrick said he had expressed his concerns in 1975 to Robert J. Patrick, then international tax counsel at the Treasury, but failed to win support for any additional assessments on the oil companies.

Patrick is now senior tax counsel for Exxon Corp. He remembered the meeting with Ham-



brick, but said he worked mainly on legislation and was not in a position to influence IRS rulings.

"That is nonsense," said Hambrick, who has been following the issue since the days of President Harry S. Truman. "Treasury policymakers prevented IRS from doing anything about credits for the OPEC taxes."

The IRS in January 1978 finally ruled that oil company payments to Saudi Arabia could not be taken as credits against U.S. tax liability because they were not actually income taxes. They were based on the "posted prices" set artificially by OPEC—substantially above the price that such oil would command in the market, IRS said.

The IRS said its 1978 decision revoked a 1955 ruling, which treated payments to Saudi Arabia as income taxes that could be used to offset income taxes owed in this country.

But Hambrick and Rosenthal contend that the facts changed dramatically in 1974, when oil prices shot up, and that petroleum companies had no justification for relying on the 1955 ruling after January 1974.

The 1978 ruling, Hambrick said, is "a cunning expedient designed to please the major oil companies with affiliates in OPEC countries and their political allies in the administration and Congress."

The result, he said, using data obtained from the Treasury by Rosenthal's subcommittee, is "a wholly unauthorized and unlawful abatement of about \$6 billion . . . in accrued federal income tax liabilities."

In his letter to the Justice Department, Hambrick said "the responsible line-officers of the IRS were prepared to implement a new position on OPEC oil taxes" four years ago, "but were restrained by the policymakers at the Treasury Department."

A JUSTICE Department spokesman said the department would respond to Hambrick's letter, but he declined to discuss the merits of the issue.

As the basis for his complaint, Hambrick cited a law that makes it a felony for any federal employee to act in such a way as to enable others to defraud the government of revenue.

In a recent report, Rosenthal's subcommittee said the oil companies were "put on notice as early as 1973 that the (IRS) questioned the continued validity of foreign tax credits." In that year, IRS held certain oil company audits in abeyance because of questions about foreign tax credits.

In 1976, the IRS even issued a press release saying foreign "tax" payments had to meet specific standards if a company wanted credit against U.S. taxes.

Thus, the report said, "any petroleum company continuing to claim foreign tax credits after 1973 did so at its own risk." Rosenthal and most of his subcommittee colleagues said the IRS' 1978 ruling should have been retroactive, at least to 1976.

But five GOP congressmen disagreed. They said oil companies, like other taxpayers, should be able to rely on IRS rulings until they are revoked.

Hambrick insists that "revocation was superfluous because the 1955 ruling was obsolete and a new position was imperative."

A Treasury official said foreign tax credits were "a gray area of the law, and to clarify it retroactively would have been a harsh thing to do."

In computing income subject to U.S. tax, oil companies can still deduct their Saudi Arabian payments as business expenses, but a deduction is worth only about half as much as a credit.

Credits provided a dollar-for-dollar reduction in taxes that the oil companies owed to the United States. Deductions reduce the income on which the tax is calculated.

A Treasury official gave this example: Assume that a company earns \$100 of income, subject to both a U.S. tax of 46 and a tax of 85 payable to the Saudi government. A

credit for the \$85 foreign tax would fully offset the U.S. tax, leaving excess credit to spare.

If, however, the \$85 were treated as a deduction, the company would still have net income of \$15 subject to a 46 percent U.S. tax. The company would have to pay U.S. tax of slightly less than \$7, compared with no tax at all when it enjoyed the benefits of a tax credit.

Rosenthal said the foreign tax credits conflicted with U.S. energy policy goals because they gave oil companies "income and incentive to explore and produce abroad at the expense of domestic production."

Even with the decontrol of prices for oil produced in this country, Rosenthal said, foreign tax credits will still create an incentive for American companies to import oil from OPEC.

President Carter proposed to close loopholes in foreign tax credit rules as part of the energy program that he announced in April.

In its ruling last year, the IRS said a foreign levy would not qualify as an income tax under U.S. standards if it was intentionally structured to tax artificial or fictitious income, as is the case with mechanisms such as the "posted price."

Tax increases resulting from retroactive revocation of the 1955 ruling could be absorbed by the oil companies or by the producing countries, or passed on to consumers through higher prices. ●

## EDUCATION FOR EXPORTING ACT

### HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in introducing the Education for Exporting Act of 1979. The act will establish a board to develop and fund educational programs designed to promote U.S. exports and will create a separate foundation to facilitate financing of the board. Rather than build strictly on Government, the Education for Exporting Act establishes a semi-private corporation that will draw on the strengths of private business and existing academic institutions while preserving some governmental ties to assure coordination with overall export strategy.

The focus of the act is on supplying future American traders with the skills of language and culture to master growing markets abroad. Export related programs may range from academic study to overseas internships with trade related organizations. The Education for Exporting Act may well be our first step to building a more effective foreign commercial service.

The current American interest in exports has been forced on us by the hard facts of international trade and the changing international economy. In 1971, we suffered our first trade deficit in this century. Our trade fortunes have varied since 1971, but the trend has hardly been encouraging. By 1977, the trade deficit had swelled to over \$31 billion—last year it was \$34 billion.

There should be some strengthening in our trade position this year, but the improvement rests as much on a weak

economy as it does on trade policy. Even America's trading future is uncertain. Growing competition in international markets may limit our ability to take full advantage of the potential gains from trade. The proliferating manufacturers of the developing countries promise a range of inexpensive goods for the American consumer and the potential of growing markets for U.S. manufacturers. But the competition for those markets is likely to be severe. Japan and Western Europe are already moving into the high technology areas where America has long held a competitive edge. Unless matched by exports, the rising import bill for oil and other raw materials will pose a constant threat to the stability of world financial markets.

The Education for Exporting Act takes one, admittedly small step toward putting the United States in a better competitive position. By assuring that one-third of the directors of the new board are representatives of small- and medium-size business, the act will help to tap the potential of some 50,000 American businesses that currently do no exporting. By mixing public funds with grants and the ability to charge fees, the new board can provide subsidized services that still cost enough to test the seriousness of the client. Most important, the Education for Exporting Act is built around a long-term American commitment to increased exports. A national trade policy has begun to open up markets for the United States in Japan, China, and many other parts of the world. To walk through those newly opened doors, we need a growing legion of businessmen trained in the language and trading customs of many lands.

Mr. Speaker, the simple fact is that we must export more. A stronger U.S. trade performance will reduce pressure on Federal budgets, bolster the domestic economy by allowing us to reap the gains of future trade and strengthen America's position around the world. Mr. Speaker, coming from Louisiana we do not usually talk about the "Yankee Trader," but when it comes to trade, we have the same spirit. I am convinced of the economic potential for a steady growth in American exports. The Education for Exporting Act will help put us on that path. ●

## HANDGUN TRAGEDY OF THE MONTH

### HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call upon my colleagues to read the following bizarre—yet tragic—account of four handgun deaths in 1 day in the small town of Bedford Hills, N.Y. What is uncanny is that the deaths were caused by a single handgun used by robbers in two separate robberies.

Since January 1, 2,475 Americans have died violent deaths by handguns. The four individuals who lost their lives in a

quiet town in New York were no more immune from the deadly handgun than are people in our most crime-ridden cities.

#### HISTORIC TOWN ERUPTS WITH HANDGUN VIOLENCE

On May 10, 1979, the quiet town of Bedford Hills, N.Y., was shocked out of its tranquility by the vicious slaying of four of its residents.

The bodies of Dr. Charles Frankel, 62, Assistant Secretary of State under President Lyndon B. Johnson, and his 61-year-old wife, Helen, were found in their home in the late afternoon. Just 8 hours earlier, Christopher Sperry, 21, son of a prominent Wall Street broker, and Nettie McCormack, an employee of the Sperry family for over 50 years, were found slain in the Sperry home.

Both the Frankel and Sperry homes, less than a quarter of a mile apart, were ransacked. All the victims were shot in the head. A .32-caliber pistol, recovered from robbers who terrorized a Brooklyn party 2 weeks after the murders, proved to be the weapon used in all four of the deaths.

Thomas A. Facelle, acting district attorney of Westchester County in which Bedford Hills is located, called the execution-style murders "the most bizarre I've ever witnessed." These senseless killings were all made possible because of a single handgun.

Dr. Frankel, Helen Frankel, Christopher Sperry, and Nettie McCormack will be counted among the handgun dead in May's handgun bodycount. The national handgun bodycount for April was 601—dead because of handguns. Since January 1 of this year, 2,475 Americans have been killed with handguns.

Twenty-four Americans are murdered every day with handguns, the favorite weapon of the criminal. No one is immune. The resident of the peaceful tree-lined town is just as likely to become a victim of handgun violence as the resident of the congested city. These victims die simply because, like the Bedford Hills victims, they are at the wrong end of a handgun—and it goes off. They will die because we have yet to take steps to place intelligent controls on these deadly weapons.

Now, because of the easy availability of handguns, the once-peaceful hamlet of Bedford must adjust to a new sense of vulnerability. How many more individuals, how many more towns and cities will have to "adjust" to handgun violence before something is done to curb the toll of death and suffering?●

#### MO UDALL WRITES IN NEW YORK TIMES ON OUR ENERGY CRISIS

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, despite the apparent severity of our Nation's latest energy shortage, there are still many Americans, both in Govern-

ment and among the voting public, who believe that this crisis is merely a temporary inconvenience, pointing the finger of blame at Government interference or bungling or at oil company plots. It is at times such as these when America is truly fortunate to have among its leaders men like the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee, Representative MORRIS UDALL. The gentleman from Arizona, in an article published in the June 17 edition of the New York Times, has put our energy problems in their proper perspective, as a "crisis of national character."

Indicating his belief that our Nation's economic decline is tied in great part to the stark fact that "we are using more fuel than we can ever produce," Congressman UDALL compares our present difficulties to other periods of "wrenching transition" in America's history. Since most of the proposed solutions to our energy problems, such as solar, geothermal, nuclear or other alternative sources of power, involve long periods of development or present environmental dangers, he sees conservation as the only answer for the short term. Congressman UDALL expresses the hope that we will overcome our "national paralysis" on the energy issue, based on self-interest and regional rivalries. Recalling President Carter's characterization of our continuing energy crisis as "the moral equivalent of war," he looks to our Nation's leaders to make the difficult decisions to move us toward increased conservation and thereby "win the war."

Mr. Speaker, this article by the Interior Committee's distinguished chairman is a brilliant analysis of the historic implications of our present energy situation and should serve as a guide and an inspiration to all of us in seeking the answers to our energy problems.

The text of the article follows:

#### AMERICA AT THE EDGE OF A WRENCHING TRANSITION

(By Morris K. Udall)

WASHINGTON.—A country's life, like that of a person, is written in chapters. Eras begin, take sudden twists, turn and end, sometimes unexpectedly. Each has a mix of problems and advantages.

Our country's chapters have a rich variety: eras of good feeling and optimism when unbounded prosperity was at hand; shattering times like the Depression; times of war, when excitement, grief and hope brought us together.

And we have seen times of drift like the 1950's, when the nation slept while the problems of our cities festered, civil rights were ignored, and the seeds of our present economic troubles were sown.

But, I am inclined to believe that the toughest chapters for our country and our people to endure and master were those times like today—when we were confronted with a major and fundamental transition in a peacetime setting. The 1870's, when slavery had ended, but new black-white relationships were yet to evolve comes to mind as a similar era.

My thesis is that our troubled country is in the early stages of a wrenching transition. From 1948 to 1968, the real income of the average working family after inflation and after taxes, doubled—an unprecedented growth. We thought it was all technology and innovations and they did play a part. But in retrospect, much of this incred-

ible advance was based on a one-shot exploitation of cheap and seemingly unlimited energy.

As recently as 1973, our national energy policy involved import quotas to keep out cheap oil. But between 1968 and 1978, the working family's income, real income, hardly improved. Productivity gains—a key to our economic miracle—are absent.

I believe the story of our lives these years just ahead will be how we adapt to oil and resource shortages and the accompanying economic dislocations and inflation, whose effects will dominate this next national chapter.

The country is seemingly embroiled in a great hunt to fix blame, yet is refusing at nearly every level to come to grips with the basic elemental truth: we are using more fuel than we can ever produce and we are apparently willing to pay the OPEC cartel and the energy conglomerates whatever they will charge.

Two central, unescapable facts are that while consumption keeps going up, United States oil production peaked in 1971, and will never exceed that level whether oil prices go to \$16 or \$116; and we will be forced one way or another in the next couple of years to reduce our total oil consumption.

Through conservation and tough measures, between the Arab oil embargo of 1973-74 and 1978, nearly all the major industrial countries reduced total oil consumption.

Japan, with its booming economy, burned less oil in 1978 than in 1973. We are the big exception, but events will force us to reduce our oil consumption as well.

A big segment of our people cannot or will not accept these realities, and we spend our time looking for scapegoats while each group and region simultaneously fights to preserve its historic consumption levels despite a declining total base of energy resources.

All of this is reflected in a kind of national paralysis that prevents the President, the Congress and all of us together from making the hard, tough decisions that sooner or later will have to be made.

Suppose a country had a new supply of oil in a place called Alaska. It builds a pipeline and a set of tankers to take it to a place called California. But there the oil was in surplus while at the same time, badly needed in the Midwest. Suppose this country had a fairy godmother who offered it one wish.

The wish would probably be to create an empty pipeline ready to be used.

Well, our fairy godmother did exactly this for us five years ago. There is an old pipeline that used to carry gas from Texas to California lying empty and ready to take the badly needed oil to the Midwest. Yet, for five years we have delayed the use of this resource, and now the Sohio Company has backed off.

Similar stories could be told about nuclear waste disposal, the alternative means of moving badly needed coal by slurry pipeline, solar power and the rest of a long list.

President Carter has tried to get the country to face up to the need to conserve oil. Yet, every initiative is opposed by enough groups and enough regions that it cannot survive.

He tried the wellhead tax for oil, a sensible proposition that was rejected by the oil-producing states.

He offered a 5-cent-a-gallon gas tax as an incentive for conservation, and it was laughed out of the House of Representatives.

Now, he is trying decontrol of oil to see if higher prices will bring conservation and new supplies, but this is attacked by the Democrats. Even a standby rationing proposal was shot down by regional squabbles. Finally, Mr. Carter's suggestion of a voluntary cut of 15 miles a week for American motorists has been responded to with yawns.



This inability to reach a consensus without crisis may be the predictable hallmark of this era of transition. This national paralysis may be the crisis that will some day soon bind the nation so that it may address the massive change from an era of surplus to an era of conservation.

There will be no quick fix. The one-time panacea of cheap, unlimited nuclear electricity lies in a shadow and is now jeopardized as much by economics as by its ardent foes.

Solar energy someday will give us great assistance, as will geothermal energy and some of the more exotic alternatives now in the research stage.

But it is the transition from the fat to the lean, from waste to conservation, from bickering and self-interest to sacrifice that must mark the change.

Many chuckled at President Carter's "moral equivalent of war" call to the American people. That reaction gave us a warning of what kind of crisis was at hand—crisis of national character.

Perhaps we only lost that battle.

Perhaps we can win the war. ●

#### A TRIBUTE TO DANIEL N. WESTIGARD

#### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a healthy local economy, based upon stable income-producing jobs, does not come about automatically. It takes enterprising work and much individual creativity to produce an inviting climate for commercial and industrial development.

Today, I would like to honor Mr. Daniel N. Westigard, who has played a big part in fostering these qualities in the business community of Carson, Calif. I would like to share with you some of his accomplishments, especially those of this past year when he served as President of the Carson Chamber of Commerce.

For over 20 years, Dan Westigard rose steadily through the corporate ranks of the Shell Oil Co. He began his career with Shell after earning his B.S. degree in accounting from San Jose State University, working as a clerk and an accountant during his early assignments. Later, after he was awarded an M.B.A. degree from Golden Gate College, he was given more responsible positions. During these years he was sent on a special assignment by Shell to work in Djakarta, Indonesia. Upon his return to the United States, he became senior auditor at Shell's Menlo Park Data Service Center.

Next, he was named manager of financial services at Shell's marketing district office in Babylon, N.Y., and then returned to California as controller of the Carson manufacturing complex.

In 1976, his duties expanded when he was appointed to serve on the Carson Chamber Board of Directors as Shell's representative. In 2 successive years, he became vice president and then chamber president. As top officer for the cham-

ber, he continued to make the organization an effective promoter of the city, benefiting both large and small business concerns of the area.

Dan Westigard's work with the chamber throughout the years has produced results. The South Bay Economic Education Foundation is now in existence due to his dedicated efforts. The foundation, an organization sponsored by the 13 chambers of commerce in the South Bay area, works, in cooperation with area educators, to upgrade the understanding of economics by youth in the area.

In addition, Dan's financial reorganization of the chamber has created a more equitable and fiscally sound structure.

Greater opportunities are taking Daniel Westigard from California. Just recently he was promoted and transferred by Shell to its Houston operations. As a prominent business leader and a friend, he will surely be missed.

My wife, Lee, joins me in offering our very best wishes to him as he moves along life's pathways. We feel certain that he will have great success in all his future endeavors. ●

#### UNREALISTIC GASOLINE PRICE AND ALLOCATION REGULATIONS

#### HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

○ Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, thousands of my constituents in two major cities of the Eighth District of Wisconsin—Appleton and Green Bay—face a complete shutdown of all gas stations in those two cities.

Tonight, virtually every gas station in these and dozens of other communities in northeastern Wisconsin are closed.

There are two reasons, but only one cause.

First, allocation levels for the gas stations are totally unrealistic.

Today, I spoke with three gas dealers who are operating at 70-percent allocation. There is no way they could make it through this week, much less the last week in June, at their present allocation levels.

Yet, the Governor's office assures me that there are adequate supplies at the Green Bay oil depots. There is no shortage of gasoline.

Second, independent truckers have blocked major oil depots in Green Bay, preventing needed shipments to many dry stations.

Ironically, many of the retail gas dealers sympathize with the plight of the independent truckers who must endure skyrocketing diesel fuel price increases without raising shipping prices.

The small gas station operator and the independent trucker both are being victimized by debilitating Government regulations and controls.

And that is the single, bottom-line cause.

As our respected colleague DAVE STOCK-

MAN pointed out so well in today's Washington Post and in a Republican task force report:

Foremost among the factors magnifying the effects of the world crude shortage are the Department of Energy's gasoline price and allocation regulations, which have supplanted the normal rapid adjustment process of the marketplace with a cumbersome administrative structure.

The blame, Mr. Speaker, rests squarely with the Department of Energy, Secretary Schlesinger, and the President.

All of us have heard dozens of complaints about DOE from frustrated constituents who are suffering under the unrealistic, unduly complex, suffocating and often illogical rules and regulations of DOE.

I daresay that if Mr. Schlesinger would spend a few hours in a gas line, or walk home at night because all the stations were closed, perhaps then he would realize what the American people are going through as a result of his ineptitude.

Mr. Speaker, the people want action, from the administration and from Congress. ●

#### A SALUTE TO OZZIE OLSON

#### HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of June 21 at Detroit's breathtaking Renaissance Center, friends of industrialist-sportsman Oscar L. (Ozzie) Olson will honor him in a "salute" dinner.

I have known Mr. Olson for a long time. He is the president of Olsonite Corp., lives in my congressional district, and one of the Olsonite plants is located in my hometown of Hamtramck. But his reputation and his gift for successful enterprise reach far beyond the Detroit area. So does his zest for living.

Ozzie Olson took a small foundry, Swedish Crucible Steel, founded in 1910 by his late father, Nels Olson, and turned it into a diversified plastics company of international standing.

One of his first moves upon becoming president of the company in 1950 was to develop a high-quality, solid plastic steering wheel for cars and trucks. Olsonite is now the leading producer of steering wheels for the automotive and marine industries in the United States and Canada. It is also a pioneer in custom plastic moldings.

The foundation of the company's success is often the subject of mirth. I seem to recall a slogan: "Tops for Bottoms." This is because Olsonite is the world's largest maker of toilet seats.

The company has six U.S. plants, including locations in Hamtramck and Detroit, and two Canadian plants.

Mr. Olson is the president and principal owner of People's State Bank in Hamtramck.

He is a booster of Hamtramck, being especially sensitive to the special feeling

of this unique enclave. It is not uncommon, for example, to find two and three generations of Hamtramck residents as Olsonite employees.

The late John (Duke) Wayne was one of Ozzie's oldest friends and consented to serve as honorary chairman of the dinner. Proceeds will go to Detroit's Northwest General Hospital for the construction of an ambulatory care center.

In addition to his wide range of business, civic, and cultural activities Ozzie Olson has had a lifelong affair with sports.

Until he withdrew from auto racing at the end of the 1975 season, he had been USAC's most successful racecar owner during the 7-year period his company sponsored the Olson Eagles on the world's top racing circuit. Premier drivers Bobby Unser and Dan Gurney were often at the wheel of Olsonite entries.

All in all, Ozzie Olson has had quite a career. He is a very considerable guy and he still is going strong.

The tribute dinner will be enthusiastic and it is deserved.

Congratulations.●

#### ATTITUDE IMPORTANT IN HEALTH CARE

**HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, recently the Surgeon General of the Navy, Admiral Will Arentzen, gave the principal address during dedication ceremonies for the opening of the Naval Outpatient Clinic at St. Albans Veterans Hospital, which is located in my congressional district.

Admiral Arentzen gave a number of good examples during his speech of the reasons that the Navy offers such superb medical treatment facilities. To him, medicine is less a matter of facilities as it is of attitude. It is a lesson that I wish all other medical officers, in and out of the armed services, would learn. I believe the Members would be well served by taking a few minutes to read the remarks of the admiral; accordingly, I insert his remarks into the RECORD:

#### RIBBON CUTTING

Congressman Addabbo, ladies and gentlemen: The last time I saw Congressman Addabbo was when I appeared as a witness before his House Subcommittee. I must say I prefer to meet you under these circumstances Mr. Addabbo!

This is not one of the larger Medical Department facilities. Because of that, there were those among my staff who considered that there were bigger, more important things that I should be doing today. Size is not my criteria for importance. Everything that we do which contributes to the delivery of health care to our beneficiaries is important, and that includes the functions of our smaller facilities.

Recently, we received some inquiries about VIP suites in our hospitals. In actuality, it has been a long time since we have had such suites save the one for the President at the

National Naval Medical Center. I was not being facetious, however, when I replied that "all of our patients are VIPs." This is precisely the attitude I have and require of my staff. Therefore, even though the relative numbers of people receiving services at this clinic may be small in the overall picture, each and every one is just as important to us as those who receive tertiary care at Bethesda, Portsmouth, San Diego, or Oakland.

This Clinic is also symbolic of a number of other issues. It is a part of a much larger Medical Region. It does not stand alone, nor is it the service appendage of another type command. Regionalization in many areas is an idea which has long since come. It has within it the capacity to provide the best, most efficient and up-to-date service to our beneficiaries. But to make it work, regionalization requires the continued attention and effort on the part of the Regional Command to ensure that the smaller satellite facilities do not suffer because of the requirements of the core hospital which is commonly more visible and closer at hand. Captain Seaton and his staff have acquitted this task admirably, as witnessed by this ceremony.

St. Albans is also a symbol of change. Less than forty years ago, this site was the beautiful golf and country club serving this community. Then with the outbreak of World War II and the expansion of Naval Activity in and around New York, a hospital of temporary single story buildup was hastily erected—soon to be followed by this grand permanent structure. It became one of the stars in the array of Navy hospitals. It became the home of some of the Navy's best teaching programs. Then the national needs changed and there was a marked decrease of Navy in New York. The Navy presence here at St. Albans was agonizingly reduced at this, albeit fine and needed, but smaller Clinic. So St. Albans is symbolic of a changing world, country, Navy and Medical Department.

St. Albans is also a symbol of another manifestation—sharing and cooperation. We, the federal services, are under more and more pressure to sit down and reason with one another upon what issues we can share. This is right, this is good. It is not simply driven by the need for cost containment—that might be enough—but it is driven by good common sense. Can or should the taxpayer afford two or more major military hospitals in the same city? Can or should the taxpayer afford two pieces of major expensive equipment such as a linear accelerator in each of those two hospitals when either one is only working half time? Can or should the taxpayer build a Veterans Hospital in a city where a comparable military hospital stands almost empty? I think not and the appropriate answer to that last question is a good example why the makeup of today's gathering is as it is. And it is why we are all here cordially together.

This trend and spirit of cooperation is and must be the trend of the future. It must and will be expanded and tuned.

Having said that and not to qualify it in anyway, let me add a word of caution. Let us not pursue our laudible cost containment issues to the point of compromising our respective missions. Sacrifice of those missions for the sake of apparent efficiency would be worse than "pennywise and dollar foolish." It would court disaster.

Again, not to deprecate the fact that we must cooperate and share, we must remember that we as separate Medical Departments do indeed have separate missions. Let us not forget to emphasize some of the elements which set us apart, not only from one another in the Federal System, but from our colleagues in the private sector. Perhaps for too long we have stressed our commonalities.

Indeed we have much importance in common. But in many instances—having said that we are all in health care delivery—divergencies commence. The primary mission of the Navy Medical Department must be to support the forces afloat, other fleet elements and the Marines—in the event they are called upon to undertake extensive and sustained combat operations. In other words: readiness. This concept is very special and very different. Infact, our mission although similar in some ways to our sister services has many unique elements which are Navy. These factors must be preserved.

As readiness is our number one challenge, so currently retention must be our number one priority in order that we have sufficient numbers of those dedicated, experienced, trained individuals to meet that challenge. It is with new facilities such as this Clinic that we can help accomplish this end. For it must be here to provide proper services to our beneficiaries. And if we can provide those services properly our staff will achieve commensurate job satisfaction. And that I think is the key to retention. I truly do not believe we need a draft to provide our personnel. What we need are elements like this Clinic to make working in the Navy attractive and satisfying. If we can make Military Clinics attractive enough we will have people clamoring to get in and stay in. And since we have this Clinic as a concrete example of the availability of some of the assets to fulfill this ideal, I am optimistic.

I think the future is bright for the Navy and the Medical Department.

I take pleasure in being able to participate in this ceremony and fervently hope this Clinic will serve long and well extending care to our beneficiaries.

Thank you.●

#### ACCEPTING SOVIET STRATEGIC SUPERIORITY

**HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, Monday, June 18, 1979, may go down in history alongside that fateful day in Munich when the Hitler-Chamberlain accord was signed. Although the time and place are different the circumstances are somewhat similar. Then British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, and his followers, closed their eyes to the unprecedented military buildup by Nazi Germany; they told themselves and their countrymen that German military superiority was nothing to worry about, that peace could only be attained through a nonaggression pact between Germany and Great Britain.

In many respects we have a similar situation today with the signing of the SALT II Treaty in Vienna by President Carter and Secretary Brezhnev. As with the Chamberlain Nonaggression Pact, the intentions may be good but the results are apt to be undesirable. What disturbs me most, Mr. Speaker, is a feeling that many of us have that the Carter administration has made a decision to accept Soviet strategic superiority as a fact of life. This is discussed in a recent article in Armed Forces Journal by Mr. Justin Galen (a pen name for a former



senior Defense Department official). Mr. Galen's article is especially appropriate for our consideration today so I commend it to my colleagues in Congress:

**THE SALT DECADE: ACCEPTING SOVIET STRATEGIC SUPERIORITY**

(By Justin Galen)

The most important issue in the FY80 budget is unquestionably its impact on the US and Soviet strategic balance and on how the SALT II and SALT III negotiations will shape the security of the West. If FY79 was the Carter Administration's "year of NATO," FY80 begins the Administration's "decade of SALT."

As a result, reactions to the FY80 budget have already tended to polarize US opinion into two camps. On the one hand, advocates of SALT II have greeted it as evidence the US will remain strong, and that SALT II will not erode the US security. On the other, opponents of SALT II have condemned it as inadequate, and as further evidence that the USSR will overtake the US and that the USSR will threaten our future security and influence.

Yet, a third interpretation of the FY80 defense budget, of the trends in the strategic balance, and of the impact of SALT, may be more correct. It is a highly unpleasant interpretation for both the current advocates and opponents of SALT, but it seems a more objective view of admittedly uncertain and controversial indicators.

**U.S. ACCEPTANCE OF STRATEGIC INFERIORITY**

This third view is based upon eight main theses:

**Thesis One:** The USSR will overtake the US in strategic strength and capabilities during the 1980s, regardless of whether or not SALT II is passed. The USSR is culturally willing to devote far more resources to this competition than the US, and the US has lost its past massive lead in technology.

**Thesis Two:** Regardless of its many defects, the US should accept SALT II. The present treaty represents the maximum level of Soviet concessions the US can hope for—indeed those Soviet concessions have been made only because the Soviets are far more afraid of the US willingness to compete than is realistically justified. SALT I and the Vladivostok accords—or no SALT II agreement—would place far fewer political constraints on a Soviet strategic build-up, and the US may lack the political will, strength, and courage to compete for leadership with the USSR.

**Thesis Three:** The domestic political factors that make the US unwilling to compete with the USSR for strategic parity or security are compounded by grave problems in DoD's efforts to develop a next generation of US strategic forces—although President Carter's reported personal resistance to multiple aim point basing (MAP) for the M-X certainly adds to the problem. The FY80 defense budget promises far more than it can deliver for reasons that largely antedate the Carter Administration. Because of the lead times involved, the Carter Administration can do little to correct this situation.

**Thesis Four:** These trends in the balance, while sharply negative, will still leave the U.S. with significant strategic strength. There is essentially no chance that the USSR would acquire a war-winning capability before the mid-1980s, and such a capability is unlikely before the mid-1990's. The FY80 defense budget commits the Administration to finishing at least those improvements in U.S. strategic targeting and conflict management necessary to insure the survival of U.S. forces in the face of Minuteman

vulnerability which were begun by Secretary of Defense Schlesinger.

**Thesis Five:** Although the USSR will not acquire anything approaching a war winning capability before the mid-1980s, the USSR will gradually acquire vastly superior counterforce capabilities, and superior counter-value capabilities. This will not weaken the deterrence of a rational strategic nuclear war, although this has not been the century of rational wars. It will, however, progressively destroy the already diminished credibility of the U.S. strategic "umbrella" in deterring any Soviet threats to our allies and to U.S. strategic interests outside the continental U.S.

**Thesis Six:** SALT II will at best offer a few short years of added security. It will not effectively limit the Soviet strategic buildup, the U.S. will then have to negotiate progressively less favorable follow-on treaties. The options for improving the strategic forces of the 1980s are so great, and so beyond precise prediction, that the provisions of SALT II will be no more effective than those of SALT I in providing long term security. SALT negotiations will be unending during the 1980s, and take the form of a new kind of "cold war." As U.S. strength steadily erodes during the decade, the "progress" from SALT II to SALT "Nth" must be expected to result in steadily less favorable agreements.

**Thesis Seven:** Given what we know about Soviet economic behavior and the Soviet defense effort during the last decade, any reduction in Soviet spending on strategic forces resulting from SALT II will be used to enhance Soviet general purpose forces. While it is unclear that SALT will lead to any reduction in Soviet spending on strategic forces, such a shift would make the West's day to day security problems worse than any increase in Soviet expenditures on strategic forces which would have occurred without SALT II.

**Thesis Eight:** The Soviets will progressively exploit their advantage with steadily growing success. The current Soviet leadership will be dead and the current US leadership will have faded from history, before the consequences of the present trade in the strategic balance become fully apparent. We do not really know the exact goals and motivations of even the current Soviet leaders; it is doubtful they have articulated such goals to pass on to their successors; and it is even more doubtful their successors would choose to blindly act on such a legacy. History is simply too dynamic to predict Soviet intentions for the 1980s. However, unless a radical change takes place in the structure of Soviet society, the USSR will constantly try to exploit the result of its superior military effort. Such efforts are sporadic and often unsuccessful today because of Soviet inexperience, and because the trends in global power favoring the USSR will not reach fruition until the mid-1980s. The West must expect more and more Soviet challenges as Soviet strategic strength grows, and as it acquires enhanced blue water, intervention and power projection capabilities.

**ANALYZING THE TRENDS IN THE BALANCE AND THE DESIRABILITY OF SALT II**

These are universally unpopular theses to advance in a society which has enjoyed the military supremacy the US has enjoyed since the end of World War II.

However, as the following articles in this issue show, there is convincing evidence that the US will slip steadily toward strategic inferiority and weakness, with or without SALT II, during the next decade.

A future issue of the *Journal* will address the provisions of the treaty, its desirability,

and its impact on the strategic balance of the 1980s.●

**BOB BERSHAD—BUSINESS LEADER OF SAN PEDRO**

**HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, later this month, on June 29, 1979, Bob Bershad will complete his term as president of the San Pedro Chamber of Community Development and Commerce. Bob Bershad deserves high praise for his success as a leader both in private business and in the San Pedro business community.

As a teenager, Bob wanted to be a newsman. He worked hard at his dream, majoring in journalism while attending Rider College in Trenton, N.J., and winning high honors. After serving in World War II, as a signal intelligence officer with the Air Corps in Washington, D.C., his hopes were fulfilled when he landed a job with the International News Service, the predecessor of today's United Press International. He continued in the journalistic field with other newspapers and also tried other professions throughout the Nation. Finally, he settled down in California and started making balloons.

From an initial investment of only \$1,000, Bob Bershad has built one of the biggest and most successful balloon businesses in the country. His Toytime Co. has sold more than 250 million balloons throughout the United States and overseas. As a newcomer to civic affairs, Bob has moved quickly to the forefront as a leader among his peers. He was asked to serve as the San Pedro chamber president. Once installed, he set high goals: The development of the marine complex on the west channel of the San Pedro harbor, and the completion of the marine museum. His hard work and leadership have brought about much progress in both of these areas. In addition, the chamber is exploring ways to make the best use of land that will become available at a local military installation, Fort McArthur.

Bob once described the San Pedro chamber as a "people's chamber." During his term as president, this phrase has become a reality. His direction has continued the organization's tradition of protecting and expanding the local economic base for the benefit of the entire community.

My wife, Lee, and I offer our congratulations to him and San Pedro upon the accomplishments during his term as chamber president. We are confident that he will continue as an inspiring figure in business and civic affairs. We also want to extend to him, his wife, Cecile, and their sons James and Todd, our sincere wishes for a bright and successful future.●

## SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 21, 1979, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

## MEETINGS SCHEDULED

## JUNE 22

8:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Parks, Recreation, and Renewable Resources Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 95, 96, and 97, bills to provide for the protection of the wildlands comprising the River of No Return and the Salmon River in the State of Idaho.

3110 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.

\*Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry  
Environment, Soil Conservation, and Forestry Subcommittee

To hold hearings on timber harvesting in the National forests and the impact timber supplies have on inflation.

322 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the nomination of John T. Rhett, of Virginia, to be Federal Inspector for the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System.

S-206, Capitol

Finance

To continue consideration of S. 505, proposing reform of the administrative and reimbursement procedures currently employed under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and other pending calendar business.

2221 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to investigate whaling activities that take place beyond the jurisdiction of the International Whaling Commission.

235 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Finance

\*Taxation and Debt Management Generally Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1063 and 1062, bills to provide for the structural simplification of the Internal Revenue Code.

2221 Dirksen Building

## JUNE 25

9:30 a.m.

Finance

Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 192 and 208, bills to provide for the tax treatment of foreign investors for property located in the United States.

2221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Antitrust, Monopoly, and Business Rights Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1246, to prohibit the growth of a monopoly power forming among major petroleum companies, and to encourage oil companies to put profits back into oil exploration, research, and development.

1318 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Improvements in Judiciary Machinery Subcommittee

To resume joint hearings with the Subcommittee on Constitution on S. 678, to reform and restructure the Federal judicial system, S. 295, to establish within the Judicial branch a system for investigating and resolving allegations that the condition or conduct of Federal judges is or has been inconsistent with good behavior required by the Constitution, and S. 522, to clarify the authority of the judicial councils to deal with instances of judicial misconduct.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on the nomination of Frederick H. Schultz, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and to be Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To receive a briefing by Administration officials on location, life style, and the future outlook of certain islands under the jurisdiction of the United States.

3110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

To hold hearings on the nominations of R. Lanier Anderson III, and Albert J. Henderson, both of Georgia; Reynaldo G. Garza, Carolyn D. Randall, and Thomas M. Reavley, all of Texas; Joseph W. Hatchett, of Florida; and Henry A. Politz, of Louisiana; each to be a U.S. Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit; and Alan A. Parker, of California, and Maurice Rosenberg, of New York, each to be an Assistant Attorney General.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

\*Labor and Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To resume markup of S. 1075, to require drug companies to conduct postmarketing and scientific investigations of approved drugs, to transmit drug information to patients and health professionals regarding the use of approved drugs.

4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Communications Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 611 and 622, bills to encourage diversity of ownership of telecommunications media and to promote competition in the provisions of the telecommunications equipment and services.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Regulation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on diesel and home heating fuel supplies and to examine the possibility of reimposing mandatory Federal price and allocation controls on these fuels.

3110 Dirksen Building

Finance

Energy and Foundations Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of the energy taxation policy for tax proposals relating to energy production.

1224 Dirksen Building

Finance

Health Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1204, to expand Federal health assistance to children of low income families.

2221 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To resume markup of S. 772-787, S. 1045, and S. 1075, bills to require drug companies to conduct postmarketing and scientific investigations of approved drugs, to transmit drug information to patients and health professionals regarding the use of approved drugs.

EF-100, Capitol

## JUNE 26

8:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the nominations of John M. Deutch, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Energy.

3110 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on S. 1076, proposed Multiemployer Pension Plan Amendments Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To resume oversight hearings on the trucking industry's economic regulation by the Federal Government.

235 Russell Building

Judiciary

Business meeting, to mark up a proposed amendment which would make a defendant liable only for damages caused by his sales and proportionate portion of damages attributable to sales by a nonconspirator to S. 390, to expedite and reduce the cost of enforcing existing antitrust laws; S. 25, to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., a legal public holiday; and S. 330, to provide for a judicial review of the administrative actions of the Veterans' Administration, and for veterans' attorneys fees before the VA or the courts.

2228 Dirksen Building

Select on Ethics

Closed business meeting.

5110 Dirksen Building



10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 734, proposed Federal Power Marketing Revolving Fund Act.

3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works  
Water Resources Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed cost sharing factors for water resources projects.

4200 Dirksen Building

Finance

International Trade Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the implementation of the United States-Hungarian trade agreement relating to industrial property rights.

2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, on pending calendar business.

4221 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed authorizations through fiscal year 1984 for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Antitrust, Monopoly, and Business Rights Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 1246, to prohibit the growth of a monopoly power forming among major petroleum companies, and to encourage oil companies to put profits back into oil exploration, research, and development.

6226 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings on the nomination of Robert N. Clement, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

4200 Dirksen Building

JUNE 27

9:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To continue hearings on S. 1076, proposed Multiemployer Pension Plan Amendments Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Financial Institutions Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1347, to provide for the improvement of consumer services and to strengthen the ability of financial institutions to adjust to changing economic conditions.

5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To continue oversight hearings on the trucking industry's economic regulation by the Federal Government.

235 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1250, to develop techniques for analyzing and stimulating technological and industrial innovation by the Federal Government.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to resume markup of S. 914, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1985, for public works and economic development programs of the Economic Development Administration, and to consider the nomination of Robert N. Clement, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To receive a briefing, in closed session, by Administration officials on military base arrangements with Turkey.

S-116, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed authorizations through fiscal year 1984 for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services.

1318 Dirksen Building

2:45 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nominations of Marcus Alexis, of Illinois, Darius W. Gaskins, Jr., of the District of Columbia, and Thomas A. Trantum, of Connecticut, each to be a Member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

235 Russell Building

JUNE 28

9:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Resources and Materials Production Subcommittee

To hold hearings on Title 5, proposed oil shale commercialization test program, of S. 1308, to provide for the development of domestic energy supply.

357 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nominations of Tyrone Brown, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission; and Geoffrey Cowan and Kathleen Nolan, both of California; Paul S. Friedlander, of Washington; Howard A. White and Jose A. Rivera, both of New York; Michael R. Kelley, of Virginia, and Michael A. Gammino, Jr., of Rhode Island, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 734, proposed Federal Power Marketing Revolving Fund Act.

3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Environmental Pollution Subcommittee

To resume joint hearings with the Subcommittee on Resource Protection on S. 1325, to provide for adequate and safe treatment of hazardous substances being released into the environment.

4200 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed authorizations through fiscal year 1984 for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services.

4232 Dirksen building

2:00 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1281 and 1365, bills to provide for the operation of the S.S. *United States* and the S.S. *Independence*, respectively, in domestic and/or foreign commerce of the United States, primarily in cruise trade between the Hawaiian Islands and the mainland.

235 Russell Building

JULY 9

8:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To resume hearings on Title 2, proposed Priority Energy Act, of S. 1308, to provide for the development of domestic energy supplies.

3110 Dirksen Building

JULY 10

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Regulation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on Title 9, proposing a mandatory fuel switching program, of S. 1308, to provide for the development of domestic energy supplies.

Room to be announced.

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the Federal Trade Commission's study of the life insurance industry's cost disclosure policy.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Resources and Materials Production Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978.

3110 Dirksen Building

JULY 11

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on the workplace, employment and training and their perspectives for the coming decade, and will focus on the Federal role in public sector employment and training policies and programs.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Aviation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the certification and inspection procedures of the DC-10 and other types of aircraft.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Resources and Materials Production Subcommittee

To hold hearings on Title 7, proposing oil and gas leasing programs, of S. 1308, to provide for the development of domestic energy supplies.

Room to be announced.

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 377 and 891, bills to provide for the reorganization of the Federal Government's international trade functions.

3302 Dirksen Building

## JULY 12

9:30 a.m.  
Energy and Natural Resources  
Energy Regulation Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on Title 9, proposing mandatory transfers of electric power to reduce oil consumption, of S. 1308, to provide for the development of domestic energy supplies.

1114 Dirksen Building

## Labor and Human Resources

To continue hearings on the workplace, employment and training and their perspectives for the coming decade, and will focus on the Federal role in public sector employment and training policies and programs.

4332 Dirksen Building

## Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the efforts made by the Veterans' Administration to provide information on benefits due incarcerated veterans.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.  
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Aviation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on the certification and inspection procedures of the DC-10 and other types of aircraft.

235 Russell Building

## Energy and Natural Resources

## Energy Resources and Materials Production Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of the Outer Continental Shelf leasing program.

3110 Dirksen Building

## Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to provide additional office space for the Department of the Judiciary.

4200 Dirksen Building

## Governmental Affairs

To resume hearings on S. 2, to provide for a review of Government programs every ten years.

3302 Dirksen Building

## JULY 13

8:00 a.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

To resume hearings on Title 2, proposed Priority Energy Act, of S. 1308, to provide for the development of domestic energy supplies.

3110 Dirksen Building

## JULY 16

10:00 a.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on S. 730, to provide for the establishment of the Energy Corporation of the Northeast designed to bring together the States, Federal Government, and private industry in a creative effort to deal with the energy problems of this area.

3110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

## Energy Research and Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on Title 8, to promote the use of gasohol in the United States, of S. 1308, to provide for the development of domestic energy supplies.

3110 Dirksen Building

## JULY 17

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology of the Committee on Science and Technology, to examine U.S. policies and initiatives of the U.S. Conference on Science and Technology for Development.

5110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

## Governmental Affairs

To resume hearings on S. 377 and 891, bills to provide for the reorganization of the Federal Government's international trade functions.

3302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

## Energy Research and Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on title 8, to promote the use of gasohol in the United States, of S. 1308, to provide for the development of domestic energy supplies.

3110 Dirksen Building

## JULY 18

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
Financial Institutions Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1347, to provide for the improvement of consumer services and to strengthen the ability of financial institutions to adjust to changing economic conditions.

5302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

## Environment and Public Works

## Environmental Pollution Subcommittee

To resume joint hearings with the Subcommittee on Resource Protection on S. 1325, to provide for adequate and safe treatment of hazardous substances being released into the environment.

4200 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

## Governmental Affairs

To continue hearings on S. 377 and 891, bills to provide for the reorganization of the Federal Government's international trade functions.

3302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

## Energy Research and Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on title 8, to promote the use of gasohol in the United States, of S. 1308, to provide for the development of domestic energy supplies.

3110 Dirksen Building

## JULY 19

9:30 a.m.

## Labor and Human Resources

## Handicapped Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142).

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

## Parks, Recreation, and Renewable Resources Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1104, to provide for the establishment of the Channel Islands National Park.

3110 Dirksen Building

## Environment and Public Works

## Environmental Pollution Subcommittee

To continue joint hearings with the Subcommittee on Resource Protection on S. 1325, to provide for adequate and safe treatment of hazardous substances being released into the environment.

4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

## Energy Research and Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on title 8, to promote the use of gasohol in the United States, of S. 1308, to provide for the development of domestic energy supplies.

5110 Dirksen Building

## JULY 20

9:30 a.m.

## Finance

## Tourism and Sugar Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 589, 749, and 940, bills to provide for the applicability of tax rules affecting foreign conventions.

2221 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

## Energy Research and Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on Title 8, to promote the use of gasohol in the United States, of S. 1308, to provide for the development of domestic energy supplies.

3110 Dirksen Building

## JULY 23

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1215, to establish a uniform Federal policy for the management and utilization of inventions developed under Federal contracts.

235 Russell Building

## JULY 24

9:30 a.m.

## Labor and Human Resources

To resume hearings on S. 446, proposed Equal Employment Opportunity for the Handicapped Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

## JULY 25

9:00 a.m.

## Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 759, to provide for the right of the United States to recover the costs of hospital nursing home or outpatient medical care furnished by the Veterans' Administration to veterans for non-service-connected disabilities to the extent that they have health insurance or similar contracts.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

## JULY 26

9:30 a.m.

## Labor and Human Resources

## Handicapped Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142).

4232 Dirksen Building

## JULY 27

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1215, to establish a uniform Federal policy for the management and utilization of inventions developed under Federal contracts.

235 Russell Building



## JULY 30

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Aviation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1300, proposed  
International Air Transportation  
Competition Act.

235 Russell Building

## JULY 31

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science, Technology, and Space Subcom-  
mittee

To resume hearings on S. 663, to estab-  
lish an Earth Data and Information  
Service which would supply data on  
the Earth's resources and environ-  
ment.

6226 Dirksen Building

## Labor and Human Resources

## Handicapped Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the  
implementation of the Education for  
All Handicapped Children Act of 1975  
(P.L. 94-142).

4232 Dirksen Building

## AUGUST 1

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Aviation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1300, proposed  
International Air Transportation  
Competition Act.

235 Russell Building

## AUGUST 2

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Aviation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 1300, pro-  
posed International Air Transporta-  
tion Competition Act.

235 Russell Building

## CANCELLATIONS

JUNE 22

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Federal  
Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 742, to provide for  
an increase in the development of  
nuclear waste management programs  
by the Federal Government.

6226 Dirksen Building

JUNE 28

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

\*Administrative Practice and Procedure  
Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1291, 755, 262,  
299, and 104, bills to coordinate and  
oversee Federal regulatory policy, to  
promote competition in the regulated  
industries, and to increase public par-  
ticipation in rulemaking procedures.

424 Russell Building